

वीर सेवा मन्दिर दिल्ली

★

3631

क्रम संख्या

काल नं०

संख्या

MENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

EMENT FOR 1945-1948

President

olville, G. C. I. E., T. D., Governor of Bombay

Vice-Presidents

t Pratinidhi, B. A., C. B. E., Rajasahab of Aundh.

rao alias Appasahab Patwardhan,

Rajasahab of Sangli

Mudhorrao alias Nanasaheb Naik Nimbalkar,

Raja Bahadur of Phaltan.

rao Shankarrao alias Babasaheb Pandit

Pant Sachiv, Rajasahab of Bhore

E. S. Jatar, Esq., C. I. E.

Sir G. D. Madgaonkar, I.C.S. (Retd.)

Dr. Sir R. P. Paranjpye, M. A., D.Sc.

N. C. Kelkar, Esq., B. A., LL. B.

REGULATING COUNCIL for 1945-1948

*Chairman **

Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, B. A., C. B. E., Rajasahab of Aundh

*Vice-Chairman **

Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, M. A., F. R. A. S. B.

Prof. K. V. Abhyankar, M. A.

Dr. A. S. Altekar, M. A., LL. B., D. Litt.

Dr. V. M. Apte, M. A., Ph. D.

Dr. P. V. Bapat, M. A., Ph. D.

† Dr. V. G. Bhat, M. A., Ph. D.

Prof. N. G. Damle, M. A.

Prin. S. V. Dandekar, M. A.

Dr. S. K. De, M. A., D. Litt.

Prin. D. R. Gadgil, M. A., M. Litt.

Mm. Prof. P. V. Kane, M. A., LL. M.

Prof. R. D. Karmarkar, M. A.

Dr. Mrs. Irawati Karve, M. A., Ph. D.

Mr. N. C. Kelkar, B. A., LL. B.

Prof. R. D. Laddu, M. A.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice N. S. Lokur,

B. A., LL. B.

Mm. Prin. V. V. Mirashi, M. A., LL. B.

Dr. V. G. Paranjpye, M. A., LL. B.,

D. Litt.

Prof. D. V. Potdar, B. A.

Prof. R. D. Vadekar, M. A.

Prof. H. D. Velankar, M. A.

Joint Trustees

Sardar G. N. Mupondar, C. I. E.

Diwan Bahadur K. M. Jhaveri,

M. A., LL. B.

EXECUTIVE BOARD for 1945-48

Prin. J. K. Gharpure, B. A., LL. B.

(Chairman)

Dr. R. N. Dandekar, M. A., Ph. D.

(Secretary)

Prof. R. G. Bhadkamkar, M. A.

(Treasurer)

Rao Bahadur Dr. S. K. Belvalkar,

M. A., Ph. D.

Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, M. A.

† Prof. A. B. Gajendragadkar, M. A.,

Ph. D.

† Dr. S. M. Katre, M. A., Ph. D.

† Dr. M. H. Behman, M. A., Ph. D.

Dr. P. L. Vaidya, M. A., D. Litt.

* To be elected annually

† Nominated by Government.

CONTENTS

VOLUME XXVI, PARTS I-II

(4-2-1946)

ARTICLES	PAGES
Science in Relation to Society by Prof. S. V. Puntambekar, M A (Oxon), Bar-at-Law. Benaras Hindu University. ...	1-13
Historical Data in Dandin's <i>Daśakumāracarita</i> by Mm Prin. V. V. Mirashi, M.A., LL B. ...	20-31
The Narasimha-Purāna by Dr. R. C Hazra, M A, Ph.D. .	32-88
Studies in the History of Indian Plants—History of Canaka (gram) as food for Horses—between C A. D. 800 and 1870 together with some Notes on the import of foreign Horses into India in ancient and Mediaeval times by P K Gode, M.A. ..	89-105
Some Interesting Problems in Mahābhārata Text- Transmission Problem No. 3 by Rao Bahadur Dr S K Belvalkar, M A., Ph.D. ..	106-119
Samudra Gupta's Conquest of Kottūra by Dr B A Saketore, M A, Ph D. ..	120-141
MISCELLANEA	
Purusāitha, Daiva and Niyati, by P C Divanji, M A, LL M ..	142-151
(i) Some forgotten Sanskrit Poets of Karnātaka (ii) Pippalikā; (iii) Kavindrakalpalatā, a Hindi work by Kavindrācārya Sarasvatī. (iv) The Sheet Anchor of Indian History, a Criticism, by Dr Dasharatha Sharma, M A, D Litt. .	152-160
REVIEWS	
Maratha History (Re-examined) 1295-1707—by Prof. S. R. Sharma, M A., reviewed by Prof. D. V Potdar, M A. ..	161-168
Iconography of Śrī Vidyānavatantra by Prof. S Śrī Kantha Śāstri, M A, reviewed by P K Gode, M A. ...	169-170
Saṅgīta Ratnākara Translated by Dr C Kunhan Raja, reviewed by G H Ranade. ..	170-171
Bharatiya Mānasasāstra-Paribhāṣī. <i>Indian Psycho- logical Terminology</i> , by Prof. D. D Vadekar, M A, reviewed by Dr R. N. Dandekar, M A, Ph D ...	172-173
Books Received ..	174-176

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

VOL. XXVI]

JANUARY-APRIL 1945

[PARTS I-II

SCIENCE IN RELATION TO SOCIETY *

BY

S. V. PUNTAMBEKAR

Introductory

I must thank you sincerely for having invited me to speak here to-day. On this occasion I wish to pay my humble tribute to the memory of the late Sir Ramakrishna Bhandarkar in whose name this Research Institute is founded, to the scholarly work which it is doing, and to the great scholars who are doing it. Their attempt to preserve, interpret, and bring to light our old but ever-new learning owes its inspiration to the great truths and teachings embodied in it.

The early creative mind of India is represented in the Vedas, the Upanisads and the two historical epics, namely, the Rāmāyana and the Mahābhārata, each of them is unique in form and content, not easily paralleled in any other literature. They represent a fathomless spiritual insight at work, a subtle and intuitive vision, and a deep and clear, intellectual and ethical thinking and heroic action which has made the permanent structure of our culture and civilisation possible.

In the long course of our history and culture the literature which has inspired, guided, and controlled our life has been the Vedic and the Epic. Its moral and intellectual depth, its social and religious contents have been our priceless treasures and our

* This paper was read on 6th July 1945, the Foundation Day of the Institute.

eternal sources of national inspiration and action, greatness and glory.

But now we find that there is an apathy towards its study. There is a decided turn towards studying only modern new sciences—physical and technological, biological and sociological. If the old knowledge is studied it is studied only for its comparative or historical value. It is considered to belong to a bygone age and to possess hardly any contemporary value.

There are two questions to be asked here, (1) is the man of to-day superior intellectually and morally, and greater in social stature and economic happiness than the one of the Vedic and Epic or our classical age? and (2) are the sciences of to-day more advanced and determinate in their social direction and values?

A new era of planning or what I call "plansichy" is being ushered in by scientists and technologists, politicians and statesmen to remove human misery and social anarchy in the old world of to-day and to build up a new world of to-morrow. In this, science, pure and applied, is going to play a dominating part in reorganising our material life and moral welfare. Our politicians are utilising the services of scientific experts in this matter. The problem before us is therefore can science alone secure these purposes without the help of ethics and religion which primarily give us our values of human life. Is the position of these planners who are devotees or advocates of science and who adopt an air of ethical superiority correct? Will science by itself give or lead us to ethical values and human welfare? Is it alone concerned with the welfare of humanity?

My argument may be summarised as follows. In the changing world of to-day there is a great moral gulf between the powers which scientific knowledge gives and the values which society pursues or ought to pursue. There is no balance between the power possessed and the good sought. This is what I want to show in my address to-day on "Science in relation to society".

Our world is a four-fold world—of science, morals, religious and art—which is ever changing and expanding. Unless

their interrelation is properly maintained, and a harmony between them is created in the process, our world will not be happy and rise in human stature.

Therefore I intend to examine the influence of science on social living, and also the nature and scope of social and natural sciences.

To-day we are living in a sick world. Can science alone help us out of it? Our needs are not only physical and mental, but also moral and spiritual. We have to harmonise them all. No doubt science has affected our outlook and judgment but its scope or province is limited. Its pointer readings are provisional and relative. There are values in life which are independent of science. They are given by other studies and inner experiences. Finally can science as such make a contribution to the good life of man?

Science in relation to Society

To-day under the name of science a number of pseudo social, sciences are developing and taking possession of society and trying to change or revolutionise it. They try to create a new historical science, a new ethical science, a new economic science, a new political science and a new social science based upon certain fundamental assumptions or ideas about matter and mind, body and soul, and the origin and development, the end and purpose, the causation and course of man and his institutions and beliefs. They increase flexibly the scope of science so as to include ethics, religion, art in it. They determine rigidly the course of its development so as to exclude other possibilities inherent or desirable in it. They put their own fixed values above truth or call them the truth.

They call the modern age as the regime or common-wealth of science which they believe is bound to lead us to a golden age in the future. I consider this view point as distorted and the "isms" which promote it and propagate it as perverting the view of science and the scope of knowledge and good given by it. Most of them are neither science, nor history nor sociology, and may be regarded as pseudo-scientific rubbish. They use the terminology of science merely to propagate their own dogmas. There seems nothing really scientific about them.

Science does not and cannot cover all the creative aspects, experience and aspirations of human life. It possesses no criteria to teach us the values of human life. If science claims that man can know and also direct and control his moral world or world destiny, there is no proof for it in 1945 nor was there before it. Nature is intrinsically and in its elements neither understandable nor subject to law, and science cannot discover any ultimates even in its own realm. The world can only be described as a ceaseless flow and fluctuation of an invisible force or tide. The world is not purely a world of reason. To-day social Darwinism is discredited, and pre-determined progressivism is considered wishful thinking. We cannot therefore treat history and sociology as merely biographies of certain ideas and laws, dogmas or beliefs nor as manifestations of certain social patterns and their wish for changes. All the 19th century sociologists and social evolutionists like Comte and Spencer, Marx and Morgan have committed this mistake. Actual historical sequences do not run true to any particular form or law. They are not their inevitable consequences. Their rigid concepts and dialectical dichotomies or patterns of natural and human life are very unscientific. Modern natural and human sciences are against these conceptual rigidities and dichotomies of nature and life.

They recognise that there are past facts and factors which are not as yet properly known, and there are present facts and factors which are new and unknown, therefore future facts and factors cannot be easily, completely or correctly known. Human thought can never exhaust the great reality and totality of time and space philosophical and historical which are themselves expanding.

Moreover, the psychical is not entirely under the heel or control of the physical causality. Psychical life is capable of continually forming new contents or taking leaps out of given elements by its power of intellectual analysis and creative synthesis. Man is not a generalised being. He is always something more, independent, unknown and unique. He is not a mere functionary. He stands on a midway between freedom and determinism. There is no such thing as dichotomy or antithesis between the individual and the society and its various changing groups.

We have to admit that a world of transcendental thought actually exists alongside the existence of the physical world, and there is something far more in the shape of values, essences, universals, than can be apprehended through empirical consciousness. We cannot presuppose the identity of the subject and the object which make dogmatic and materialistic philosophies of to-day possible, we do not believe in either the subject devouring the object as the idealist does or the object devouring the subject as the materialist does. Science through controlled description, experimentation and inference aims at logical and consistent hypotheses and generalisations or laws of behaviour. On their basis we are asked to predict and to control our behaviour. This has led to the development of the concept of types and patterns, ignoring the recognition of the unique and specific features of human behaviour. But the process of induction has a limited value. It can only generalise from a limited field of particulars. Therefore its general is also a generalised particular, and cannot be the universal. To-day there is a revolution in science. Matter in the sense of spatial substance has ceased to exist. Fundamental ideas of matter and motion have changed. Matter is alive, is energy. Matter-mind is considered as an inspired something in motion and action. Science is found unable to lead us to the knowledge of its substance. It is only a method of knowing its structure. It creates a conceptual model by which we briefly resume our experience of known facts. It cannot give us judgments of the reality but only of its relativity and relations. It merely gives us a concise statement of *how* changes are taking place. It cannot explain *why* they have taken place in particular ways. The aim of science is now ceasing to be the discovery of cause and effect, because the universe is being considered a sum of phenomena, some of which are more, others less, closely contingent on each other. This conception is wider than that of causality. Some assert that no phenomena are causal, and all phenomena are contingent. The problem before us is therefore to measure the degree of this contingency which lies between the zero (individuality) of independence and the unity (commonness) of causation.

It is held to-day that beyond and superior to the physical world lies the world of value characterised by a spiritual unity which is absent from purely material phenomena. Therefore life can be understood only from the standpoint of values which are given by great or inspired men. The extrinsic analysis of science fails to differentiate between human values and environmental or structural relations, between thought as a function of society and thought as a function in society.

Science reasons from quantity, experience and commonness. It explains relations and processes and results in relative or rigid abstractions and generalisations. Scientific process as one puts it merely 'unifies', 'mobilises' and 'levels' what is observed and demonstrable. Moral process reasons from quality, experience and uniqueness. It gives concrete values, and by its valuational function 'divides', 'specialises' and 'arranges' in order of merit from what is experienced and unstandable. (Dilthey's *erlebnis* and *verstehen*).

Shall we start with a proposition like Rousseau's "Man is born like an animal but proposes to live as an angel." What should be his method? We shall have to find it out, with the help of the real knowledge of nature and of the actual life of man in history. Our knowledge is ever increasing and our life is ever expanding. There is no settled balance or harmony between the discoveries of one and the desires of the other. At present there has arisen a great moral gulf between the powers which knowledge gives and the purposes which our life pursues. To bridge it we cannot accept the easy and cheap unilinear solutions propounded by scientists and socialists as the last word of science or moral living. They prove to be inadequate, as they ignore some of the facts and values of life, distort others and fail to distinguish between the common and the unique.

We are today hearing the swan-song of a passing world, an age of definite values and untroubled certitudes. Each age has its dominant note and outlook, and its dominant interests and preoccupation. It has its own mentality and moral climate. But new facts and factors have arisen in our epoch. They are stubborn and living. Our new knowledge and experience, material

and mental, and our new views and values, moral and social, are all in conflict with the old order of knowledge and life. Our epoch is not homogeneous mentally and morally. There is a new revolution created by scientists and a new revelation propounded by socialists in both these spheres. A minority of scientists and socialists have ushered in a new era in technology and ideology, an epoch of new orders to be created in the material, mental and moral life of man. Science as a whole with its developments in physical, biological and psychological studies, and philosophy in its total valuations in the fields of anthropology, anthropogeography and sociology have both created a new world of natural powers and social values, which now require to be studied, correlated and harmonised for our good. This is what we mean by "Science in relation to Society."

Our scientific knowledge is new and advanced. Our social life has become close and complex. Therefore we have to adjust them both in the interests of the great society which is taking shape. But we must not start with fixed solutions and determinate laws. Whatever does not fit in their scheme we must not ignore, deride or discard. Ours is not an age of one-eyed reason and monocled vision, ignoring the variety and depth of human life. We have to look to the facts of human sufferings and needs, and also to the demands of human nature and values, in order to estimate and to propose the course of life which we should follow. We are living today in a fourfold world of knowledge and action. It is a world of science with the powers and perils it generates, a world of morals with the loves and hatreds it harbours, a world of religion with the confidences and consolations it creates, and a world of arts and crafts with the intuition and cunning it possesses. Every aspect of our thought and life is subject to and surrounded by one or other of these worlds or even by all. The contents and drives of these worlds are ever increasing. Those with limited understanding and rigid out-look consider one or the other as more important, and their one or the other stage as more true, while the problem before humanity is to recognise, understand and experience their disciplines as a whole. It is one of the most difficult tasks which the leaders of human thought and life face today—the task of synthesizing and

harmonising their separate urges. We must postulate that the advance of humanity is not unilinear but multilinear, not through fixed but fluctuating stages, not under one discipline but many.

Can we demarcate the various aspects of human life and allot their fields exclusively to particular methods of study and approach, or can we treat the whole human life as one and allocate it either to religion, morals or science only to be studied and valued by it, or shall its various aspects be studied separately by different sciences and philosophies and also jointly by them and aiming at the highest ends of humanity.

Science has today influenced greatly our social thinking and social living. It has also affected our moral and religious attitudes. Pure sciences have changed our processes of our social thinking, and applied sciences our methods of social living. Mathematical, physical and biological sciences have discredited our mythologies of creation and credologies of this worldly and other worldly life. They have led to the growth of new social or human sciences whose methodology is based on those of natural sciences. No doubt, if we compare these sciences, the subdivisions of social sciences—sociology, anthropology, economics, politics, unlike those of natural sciences, seem largely, though not entirely, abstractions from reality, not sections of reality. In physical and biological sciences, physics, chemistry, botany and zoology, the objects of study such as elements, plants, animals seem real and independent objects and groups. They are not aspects of something complex. They are real things. The subjects of social sciences are mostly aspects of and abstractions from social reality. Their study depends on the contents of those aspects and their relation to the whole social reality, and not upon merely its subdivisions or factors mapped out for the purposes of study. The problem of natural sciences is the problem of observation and experiment and a search for laws of behaviour or action of the objects of study. The problem of social sciences is the problem of understanding and experiencing the course and relation of social life and a search for its values in time, place and objective

The natural scientist can stand outside his objects of observation. The social scientist must stand inside his subjects of study. Thus it is not possible to apply fully the methods of physical sciences to the study of man and society. But they give upto a certain stage great help in the study and analysis of human social processes and relations, mental attitudes and behaviours. In the natural sciences the aim is to bring certain qualities of as many objects as possible under the fewest possible generalisations. In these generalisations the objects are not explained in their individuality but in their resemblances and relations which they bear to one another. In humanistic studies where we deal with aspects of human life - individual and social - we are not dealing with general conceptions alone, but far more with values which are drawn from individual conceptions. We deal with what is individual and unique, with values of the unique, and with the meaning of the unique.

The contribution of science to our civilisation is very great. Its attitude and methodology, its outlook and technology have been great factors in its growth. It is due to it that our social current is moving so rapidly, taking new forms and contents, and growing broader and deeper towards a new humanity.

Our new world is a world of science and invention, technology and engineering. Science belongs to and can be appropriated by the whole world. Its methods and discoveries, products and processes can be understood and applied by all. It gives the same results everywhere objectively. It does not require any God to be pleased or any prophet to be admired. It does not lay down any frontiers, physical, mental, moral or cultural, for deriving its benefits. It primarily represents an attitude of mind, a mood of approach, an experimental method, by which we discover and verify realities, organise ascertained facts in consistent groups, learn their structural relations, and ascertain their place in the larger scheme of knowledge.

In spite of great advances in science we are living in a sick world today, a world of political anarchy and economic misery, social maladjustments and communal hatreds. We are all ailing and suffering from a number of evils. Our life and living are not happy and contented. Can science help us in promoting our

security and welfare ? Can it alone do it ? Science can give us scientific means and methodology, scientific spirit and attitude. Its service in the past has been great. We have advanced from a donkey-house civilisation where all was stable and unchanging, neither free nor equal, to a new monkey-house civilisation where everything seems to be unstable, free and in conflict. But still it is a progress to better forms of life and higher standards of living. But what worries us is the instability and anarchy in our life. If Science can lead us to a plan-key house civilisation where both order and progress, equality and freedom, on human scale are harmonised, then it will have done its work well. The human Caravan has no doubt passed through primitive stages of innocence and ignorance, and the medieval ages of blind faith and escapism, and has now reached the modern stage of science and its age of hope. Today in all arts of war and peace science reigns supreme. Science is not merely conserving our life and giving us minima of living, but is also helping us in achieving good life. Our problem is not only of mere physical existence and material welfare but also largely a problem of good life. Today our difficulties are those of choosing our moral aims and forming social relations. Unprecedented knowledge of Science and the power it has given over natural forces and human resources have created unprecedented conditions in human contact and relations. Unless there is a corresponding development in our moral attitude and mental approach, we cannot utilise the knowledge and power of science to cope with those conditions and to promote human security and welfare. Science must not only assure us conditions of physical and material security—food, housing, clothing, health and hygiene, but also insure means for our mental and moral welfare, education and co-operation, peace and progress. The new kingdom or order which Science wants to build up must understand our material needs, take account of our resources and apply them for our physical security as well as social welfare.

Our progress towards a higher standard of living depends on (1) our natural and human resources properly developed and applied, (2) our scientific inventions and technological applications, (3) our faith in the brotherhood of humanity as a whole,

in its unity and creativity, (4) our moral code of equality and freedom, and (5) our political system and economic advance. The fundamental facts of our world are its increasing population, its increasing want leading to unemployment and poverty in various areas, its social maladjustments and misappropriations, its increasing contacts, resulting in hatreds and crimes and its increasing fear and frustration, all these leading to an increase of human misunderstanding and hatreds, splits and conflicts. Our problems have therefore to be solved on three planes—material, moral and mental. History shows that Science, Ethics and Religion are the disciplines which are expected to suggest correct ways of doing this. No doubt fundamentally all social problems are interrelated, and all disciplines, scientific, moral and religious, are concerned with the choice of correct ways in a number of possibilities which are latent or open, or invented by man's mind. Science will become more important if it helps not only in the choice of means, but also that of ends which involve moral and mental judgments. Science primarily gives the means to control nature and to use it for human welfare. It assures the material foundations of our social well-being. It tries to solve the problem of our misery by providing means to cope with our wants

But can it also provide solutions for the choice of moral ends, the betterment of human relations, and for the development of a will to live or a faith in the future

Will Science satisfactorily answer, the questions of the good, the beautiful, the real as human quests, of human destiny and of man's rebirth, or life after death ? These questions have a spiritual value and require experience. Can Science also take the place of philosophy, art and religion ? Science at present does not acknowledge that the affairs of men are subject to any divine or transcendental power, or to any blind, benign or malign fatalism. Science believes in finding out empirically correct knowledge of natural and human behaviour and adopting it for controlling nature and guiding man. Science is confident that it can solve welfare questions and remove social maladjustments, if men accept the social habits of altruism and work, and the moral attitude of equality and brotherhood, and give up proper-

tieling and profiteering ways and aims. But these social and moral qualities are indicated and affirmed by ethics and religion. Science cannot analyse or prove them by its own methods of study. Thus our attitude in relation to social problems must be an ethico-religio-scientific attitude. But science even then will give its methodology to other disciplines, its spirit of unbiassed examination of facts of human experience and behaviour, and its critical judgment.

But all these disciplines with their different aims and approaches, fields and outlook should be harmonised and properly inter-related. If they claim to be true by themselves and are rigid in their attitudes, then human problems will become difficult to be solved. Man acquires knowledge not only through reason, experiment and nature, but also through intuition, experience and history. His problem is not merely of action but also of valuation and will-power. Science studies nature and tells us how to live with it. Morals study man and society and tells us how to live in it. Religion studies the creation of nature and the course of man, and gives us a will to live. Each of them influences man's life as a whole. But if each of them propounds rigid ways not in harmony with one another, then a fundamental conflict within social life will be created and none of them will solve satisfactorily human problems. Therefore our problem is one of synthesis and harmony. We have to render to each of them their due, but not to surrender to one at the cost of the other or of the whole. Science and technology give physical welfare. Ethical valuation gives moral stability. Religious intuition gives faith in life and will to live. Our postulate is that every detail of human life is extremely complicated. It is connected with every other detail by innumerable threads of habit and custom and ideas of good and evil, and by economic interest and emotional feeling. Hence all the disciplines which can guide and control them are necessary. Science gives utilities for human welfare - such as health and hygiene, longevity and livelihood, leisure and recreation. Morals promote qualities of human happiness such as liberty, equality, and fraternity; justice and toleration, truth and non-violence, chastity and greedlessness. Religion creates a faith and will to live by expounding the reality in and behind life and universe.

Though science does not contribute directly to the determination of values of life, it does great service by providing the conditions and laying down the foundation of a better world order and higher human values. In creating a better economic life and in assuring higher standards of living and leisure it makes the realisation of moral and religious values on a large scale possible

Thus we are living today in the republic of Science and technology which makes human cultural contacts more intimate, easy and expansive. It gives better environment, better means of livelihood, housing and clothing, better protection against natural calamities and diseases, better health and hygiene, better means of conveyance and communication. It widens the means of self-expression and education, and opportunities for service and vocation. It increases our understanding of the world, tells us of different types of human societies and of the unity of mankind and of its continuity, diffusion and fusion in space, time and culture. It transcends the barriers of race, language, region and religion in its sweep in a search for knowledge. It gives a methodology of open approach to knowledge and throws open its doors to all those who seek its shelter and admission. It does not build a mystic house or prison round its knowledge and ways of life. Thus the republic of science is the most advanced commonwealth of mind without any particular territory, without standing armies and without secret diplomacy. Yet it possesses the most powerful government in the world. Without science and scientists the modern civilisation will collapse

It has ushered in new ways of life and new means of living. It has increased production, developed communication, adjusted distribution and provided for consumption by its new mechanical inventions, technical appliances and engineering skill. It has affected our mental, moral and cultured outlook and trained our judgment for choice of right relations of life and correct ways of behaviour. It has given a new forward look and useful knowledge about many questions of our life. It has done away with the age of superstition. It has removed the peril of being subjugated by less civilised neighbours of being overwhelmed by

hordes of barbarian invaders. It has introduced secularisation and rationalisation. It has improved the life of common man. It has freed, educated and inspired mankind. It has expanded the individual and his field of activity and contact, his understanding and knowledge by its inventions, new tools and mechanical processes.

In spite of the value of Science as the main foundation of modern civilisation, its scope is limited. It can analyse relations not reality, structure and not substance of life. It can give pointer-readings but not life values. It can show natural sequences but cannot estimate social consequences. Further the 20th century developments of Science have shaken its principle of causality and predictability. They do not claim any certainty, determinism or infallibility for their statements and conclusions. All aspects of man's life and of natural phenomena are not as yet understandable, predictable and controllable. They cannot be studied and understood merely as isolates and their totality is too complex to be clearly envisaged and fully analysed. Consequently the truth and laws of science are also becoming provisional and relative.

As scientific methods cannot comprehend and explain values, such as goodness, freedom, and love, some scientists say there are no values, no goodness, no freedom, no love and so on. To them these things do not exist. With them the object has devoured the subject. The man, the mind, the spirit, the morals have all withered away along with any transcendent God. Therefore the conception and content of science, its explanations and conclusions should not be considered as rigid and final, but only relative and provisional. Its mechanical aspect, its cause and effect relations should not be overemphasized. It must take account of moral and religious limitations of the people in using its power and making its application to promote their ends. Science must become and remain an ally or handmaid in the task of achieving highest human values and not prostitute its power and skill for narrow and selfish group interests. It must promote political integration, social welfare and economic opportunity and cultural progress.

We must however, avoid the danger of the power of science falling into the hands of monsters of men and nations who are not ministers of peoples, security and welfare. Otherwise a new barbarism more dangerous and disastrous to humanity than the old will develop and devour men and destroy the very foundations of human civilisation. Scientists must be able to control the forces they have let loose. Otherwise the new *Bhasmāsura* of science will destroy the scientist and his creation, the new civilisation. Science has out-stripped the advance of human morals. The growth of its power is not accompanied by a corresponding growth in morals and culture of humanity. There is a disharmony and want of balance between them. Our moral and cultural lag has allowed the power of Science being used by imperialists and capitalists for aggrandisement and exploitation of the disinherited peoples and workers of the world. Science must be accompanied by a high moral sense of duty and cultural discipline and responsibility. Uncontrolled science would be a great danger to humanity and its civilisation.

The social results of scientific development are very great. It has given us a conception of one world, one humanity, and a universal society, by developing rapid means of communication, transport and close contact, and by opening the doors of all countries and regions to all peoples. It has developed a law of evolution and convergence of cultures. It has perfected a method of observation, experiment and study and has given a breadth of outlook, a tolerance of opinion, a sense of cooperation and a measure of detached judgment and impersonalness which are very valuable not only for acquiring knowledge but also for our moral living and for our will-to-live. It has enormously increased our control and use of natural forces and satisfied our increasing material needs. It has set us on the path of assured material progress and mental achievement. It has minimised the sacredness of particular persons and the despotism of authority. It has changed values of life, if it has not been able to estimate values of life. It does not prepare any Procrustean bed of determinism for man's guidance like any religion or "ism." It does not make facts fit any preconceived theory of its own, because it has no preconceptions. Huxley said "Science commits suicide when it adopts a creed."

The results of scientific research are now being applied to practical affairs and are profoundly changing our civilisation and affecting human happiness.

Science makes possible the material welfare of man. Can it also make a contribution to the good life of man? Science tries primarily to find out the nature, the character and the direction of the evolutionary process in the world as a whole, and also to elucidate the causes of human actions and their consequences in relation to that direction. But there is nothing in the results of science today for us to believe that it can guarantee to us the absolute stability of even the most general laws that it has stated. The central problem of good life seems to be difficult to be solved only by methods and direction given by natural and social sciences. They can throw light on the way in which the mind of man can apprehend values, but they cannot determine whether they are truly values and what the scale of moral values is. If the development of moral values was to be determined wholly by external conditions, and they did not depend for their appreciation and choice on internal factors, then any true law of science—rational or dialectical—could give us a scheme and scale of good values of life. But as the environment influences life so also the inner ideas, feelings and attitudes greatly mould our life. If it is true to say that societies create ideas, it is even more true to say that ideas change societies. The theory of evolution seems to suggest that its course is towards some complex forms of life and that all moral ideas are primarily relative. But in that process *who* chooses some of these and rejects others unless it is the inner moral consciousness of man. Can the scientific study of the world process teach us what is good and what we ought to do. Science cannot say that it is moral or immoral. Its characterisation can only be a-moral. It cannot even predict and say it 'will' or 'must' happen. It can tell us only what has been, what is, and what will probably and not certainly be. It also cannot tell us that what has been, is, and will be right and good. We have to recognise the presence and force of inner factors which are inspiring and determining in the choice of values and ways of life. Our life can be really understood in terms of values, not merely in terms of its various stages and factors. These values constitute various types—such as the scientific, the moral, the religious, the aesthetic. Each one

of these types shows a particular structure of the human mind or quest. The man dedicates himself to one or more of these types. Therefore a time has now arrived for creating a closer union of the achievements of knowledge and the values of life. Science, morals, religion and art must give more help in the development of the deep and universal elements of our personality. All these branches of knowledge have at present developed a one-sided approach and atmosphere and hardly any attempt has been made to connect the whole knowledge and experience with actual values and intuitions of human life. The most disturbing fact of our time is that our knowledge of Science and especially its practical applications have far outrun our conceptions and practices of good life. Science has now placed great means and instruments of world-shaking, world-shocking and world-shaping power in the hands of our political rulers and economic power-holders who abuse them for their own unrighteous purposes of subjection and exploitation. These means and tools are in themselves non-moral. We need not blame the science, but the man who uses them or the scientist who prostitutes them. Thus morality or the will to good lies in the man himself. It is due to his choice of wrong ends and misuse of good means that the will to evil or immorality arises. It is not the province of science to tell us whether the means and ends adopted are good or bad morally.

Then, who are the real authors of any ethical change or choice? Certainly they are not found in the environmental change or mutation, but in the ethical choice and rise of men. It is a Buddha or a Christ, a Krishna or a Muhammad, a Tolstoy or a Gandhi who points the way to new levels of conduct and new standards of value, and it is by a conscious choice and struggle under his leadership that humanity accepts them. It cannot be admitted that the course or direction of evolution is inevitably good or right. We do not and cannot know that its goal is also good. One cannot trace in it any particular purpose which is continuously and necessarily good. We cannot postulate any materialistic inexorable or moral determinism in it. We cannot consider human mind as merely a mechanism of stimulus and response. It also holds within itself a set of urges or drives. Any one of them may be set in motion and come forward to change

the ethical or social current. Therefore the theory of evolution and its moving towards a right direction achieving good all along becomes a myth from the social point of view. The theory of social Darwinism is now completely discredited and discarded. Science may tell us what to do to reach a desired end or to achieve a desirable purpose. But it cannot point out to us what end to desire. It cannot guide us in the choice of our purpose. Science is the expression of our will to know our environment (of the past) - its causation, course, connection and consequence. It invents the means to know it and tools to use it for our physical existence and material welfare. Morals are the expression of will to good life (in the present) - its behaviour and relations. It lays down the principles of good conduct. Religion is the expression of our will to live creative life (in the future) - its consciousness and continuity. It lays down its affirmations and prohibitions of spiritual life. Art is the expression of our will to feel the eternal - its beauty and enjoyment. It gives us its impressions and creations of the reality.

But if we confuse the separate spheres and functions of these and surrender to any one discipline the whole province of human life and its aspirations, then we create a conflict of means and values in our study of man and environment. We must study and express these aspects, - will-to-know, will-to-good, will-to-live, and will-to-feel, - separately and then correlate and synthesize their directions for the existence and welfare of man.

In early times religion absorbed or dominated all aspects, and laid down rules for human behaviour from the point of view of its own approach. It became science, morals, art and religion, all in one. Then these aspects were separated. But still each one of them claimed dominance for its own approach and methods of life. Science now wants to reject all other approaches in order to absorb them in its universal approach and to lay down its own rules for the discipline and welfare of life. It wants to drive all others out of the field. In this unity of approach, either the subject devours the object, or the object devours the subject. Science now wants to tell us not only about the means i. e. - how values or ends can be achieved, but also about the ends i. e. - how to

choose our values, and what values are valid. No doubt knowledge of ourselves and of our environment has in itself both a moral significance and a social consequence. It will however only help us in our choice of values and not in their final determination. Science gives survival means in a natural environment ; ethics, moral values in a social environment , and religion, a spiritual faith in physical and social environment (man and nature). If their discoveries and disciplines are properly correlated and harmonised, we shall understand the field and position of each, and the part they play in the stability, security and well being of human society has a whole.

Thank you

HISTORICAL DATA IN DANDIN'S DAŚAKUMĀRACARITA

BY

V. V. MIRASHI

Nearly forty years ago Mark Collins drew attention to the narrative in the eighth *Ucchvāsa* of the *Daśakumāracarita* which pointed to the existence of a large southern power ruling over Vidarbha, with no fewer than six feudatory kingdoms owing allegiance to it¹. Collins saw in this a reflex of the actual conditions existing in the days of Dandin himself and therefore investigated the matter for fixing the date of that Sanskrit author. Since then there has been considerable progress in our knowledge of the ancient history of India in general and of the Deccan in particular, which makes it necessary that the problem should be rediscussed in the light of recent researches.

As is well known, the *Daśakumāracarita* describes the adventures of ten Kumāras who were followers of Rājavāhana, the son of the dethroned king Rājahansa of Magadha. One of them was Viśruta whose adventures are narrated in the eighth and last *Ucchvāsa* of the original work of Dandin. The story of that chapter may be summarised as follows—

'In the country of Vidarbha there ruled a king named Punyavarman who belonged to the ancient Bhoja race. He was a very just and righteous king who protected his subjects, chastised his foes and gave liberal patronage to learned men. He was succeeded by his young son Anantavarman. This prince, though intelligent and accomplished in all arts, neglected the science of politics. Vasuraksita, the old minister who had been highly respected by his father, counselled him again and again to apply himself to the study of *dandanīti*, but Anantavarman, coming under the evil influence of his courtier Vihārabhadra, treated the advice with contempt, gave himself up to the enjoyment of pleasures and

¹ Mark Collins—*Geographical Data of the Raghuvamśa and Daśakumāracarita* (1907), p. 21.

indulged in all kinds of vices, neglecting the affairs of State. His subjects imitated him and led a vicious and dissolute life. As a consequence, disorder and lawlessness became rampant in the kingdom. Finding this a suitable opportunity, Vasantabhānu, the king of the neighbouring Āsmaka country, sent his minister's son to the court of Vidarbha. The latter ingratiated himself with the king and egged him on in his dissolute life. Ultimately, when the country was thoroughly disorganised, Vasantabhānu instigated the king of Vanavāsi to invade the kingdom of Vidarbha. Anantavarman then mobilised his forces and called his feudatories to his help. Among those who rallied under his banner were, besides Vasantabhānu of Āsmaka, Avantideva of Kuntala, Virasena of Murala, Ekavira of Rśika, Kumāragupta of Konkana and Nāgapāla of Nāsikya. Followed by these feudatories, Anantavarman marched against the king of Vanavāsi and encamped on the bank of the Varadā.¹ Vasantabhānu, however, secretly conspired with the king of Kuntala and caused disaffection among other feudatories also. They treacherously attacked Anantavarman in the rear while he was fighting with the invading forces of the king of Vanavāsi. The king of Vidarbha was killed in the fight. Vasantabhānu then contrived to cause dissension among the feudatories also. They fought among themselves for the spoils of the war and destroyed one another. He then appropriated the whole booty and giving some part of it to the king of Vanavāsi, induced him to return to his country and himself annexed the whole kingdom of Vidarbha.

In the meanwhile the old minister Vasuraksita, who was true to his salt, safely escorted Vasundharā, the queen of Ananta

¹ The Bombay Sanskrit Series edition of the *Daśakumāracarita* (p 138) states that the army was encamped on the Narmadā which is evidently incorrect. As shown below, Vanavāsi, the well-known capital of the Kadambas, was situated in the North Kanara District of the Bombay Presidency. The ruler of Vanavāsi could not have penetrated to the Narmadā, without overrunning the entire Vidarbha which he had not evidently done. I therefore accept the reading *Varadā-rodhasi* (in place of *Narmadā-rodhasi*) given by an old Ms., which is evidently a mistake for *Varadā-rodhasi* 'on the bank of the Wardhā' (see Agasthe's ed. p 138, n.). Since this was written, my friend Mr. P. K. Gode informs me that the reading *Varadā-rodhasi* is actually given by an old Ms. of the work, dated V. S. 1816, now deposited in the Bhandarkar Institute.

varman and her two children Bhāskaravarman and Mañjuvādinī to the court of Mitavarman, the half-brother of Anantavarman who was ruling at Māhismatī. The latter, finding that his advances were rejected by the queen, suspected that she wanted her son to inherit the kingdom of Māhismatī. He therefore desired to kill the young prince. The latter, however, escaped with the help of a trusted old servant and while roaming through a Vinḍhya forest chanced to meet Viśruta who turned out to be his re alive. Viśruta then vowed that he would exterminate the king of Āsmaka and place Bhāskaravarman on his ancestral throne. He then disguised himself and Bhāskaravarman as Kāpālikas and repaired to Māhismatī. There he killed Pracaspavarman, the brother of Candavarman, the king of Mālava, who had come there to marry Mañjuvādinī. Viśruta also contrived to cause Mitavarman's death by means of a poisonous garland. He then married Mañjuvādinī and looked after the affairs of State in the kingdom of Māhismatī on behalf of Bhāskaravarman¹.

Dandin's narrative ends here abruptly. So we do not know whether Viśruta succeeded in fulfilling his vow by destroying Vasantabhānu and placing Bhāskaravarman on the throne of Vidarbha.²

The narrative sketched above points to the existence of a large southern Empire. The Emperor belonged to the ancient lineage of Bhoja. He ruled directly over Vidarbha which comprised modern Berar, the Marāṭhī-speaking districts of the Central Provinces and the portion of the Nizam's State north of the Godāvari. The kingdom of Anūpa, whose capital was Māhismatī was incorporated with that of Vidarbha and was ruled by the emperor's half-brother. Vidarbha had a number of feudatory kingdoms viz., Kuntala, Āsmaka, Rāṭka, Murāla Nāsikya and Konkapa. Of these Kuntala comprised the upper valley of the Kṛṣṇā and included the modern Southern Marāṭhī Country and Kanarese districts of the Bombay and Madras Presidencies. Its northern limit was probably the Godāvari.³ This seems to have been a powerful kingdom, for Vasantabhānu wanted

¹ The *Uttarapīṭhikā* which completes the story states that Viśruta succeeded in fulfilling his vow, but this work is very late.

² *A. B. O. R. I.*, Vol. XXV, p. 40.

to enlist its ruler's support to his plot before he approached other feudatories. Āśmaka which figures very prominently in the story comprised, according to the *Suttampāṭa*, the country along the bank of the Godāvarī. Rśika which is mentioned together with Vidarbha, Āśmaka and Anūpa in the Epics and inscriptions, could have been none other than the modern district of Khandesh as shown by me elsewhere.¹ Āśmaka and Rśika were thus contiguous countries and were separated from each other by the Ajantā or Sātmālā range. Murala was perhaps the country watered by the Muralā which figures in the *Uttararāmacarita* as a tributary of the Godāvarī. Nāsikya was of course the country round Nasik in the Bombay Presidency. Konkana is the well-known name of the strip of land between the western sea and the Sahyādri mountain.

The Empire of Anantavarman therefore extended from the Narmadā in the north to the Tungabhadra in the South and from the Arabian sea in the West to the Vaingangā in the East. Beyond the frontiers of this kingdom lay the powerful kingdom of Mālava in the North, that of Kosala (modern Chhattisgarh) in the East and of Vanavāsī (modern Banvāsī in North Kānara) in the South. Mālava and Kosala appear to have been friendly to Vidarbha, the latter was even matrimonially allied with it. Vanavāsī, however, seems to have been hostile.

Mark Collins showed that this state of things existed only in the sixth century A. D. under the rule of the Vākātakas. When he wrote, the chronology of the Vākātakas was very uncertain. Owing to the mistaken identification of Devagupta mentioned in Vākātaka land-grants with the homonymous king who belonged to the dynasty of the Later Guptas,² the Vākātakas were believed to have flourished in the eighth century A. D. It redounds to the credit of Collins that he did not subscribe to the prevalent view, but independently evaluated the evidence and showed that the Vākātakas flourished in the Gupta age—a conclusion which has since been incontrovertibly proved by the discovery of the Poona

¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. XXV, p. 168.

² This identification was first proposed by Dr Fleet and was accepted by Dr Kielhorn. Dr. Bühler, however, dissented from it and placed the Vākātakas in the 5th century A. D.

plates of Prabhāvatiguptā; for they show that Devagupta was another name of Candragupta II. In some other respects, however, Collin's conclusions were erroneous, based as they were on insufficient data.¹ We shall therefore review the history of the age to see what particular period of the Vākātaka rule is reflected in Dandin's narrative.

We must remember at the outset that we must not expect to find the names of historical personages in this narrative. Like his predecessor Kālidāsa and his successors Rājasekhara and Padmagupta,² Dandin has plainly changed the names of the characters who figure in the story. But in other respects his narrative may be expected to contain a reflex of the historical events.

Let us first take a brief survey of Vākātaka history. Towards the close of the third century A. D. the Vākātakas had a fairly extensive empire in the Deccan. Pravarasena I who was the real founder of Vākātaka power, is said to have performed four Aśvamedhas besides several other Srauta sacrifices. He had four sons among whom, according to the Purāṇas,³ his extensive empire was divided after his death. The eldest branch held northern Vidarbha and ruled first from Nandivardhana near Rāmtak (ancient Rāmagiri) in the Nagpur District and afterwards from Pravarapura which has not yet been identified, but which may be Paunar in the Wardhā District. The second branch ruled over southern Vidarbha from Vatsagulma, modern Bāsim in the Akola District. The other two branches may have ruled to the south of

¹ For instance, Collins thought that the Vākātakas rose to power in circa A. D. 400 and flourished till A. D. 600 and that they were connected with the Western Ksatrapas who disappear from history towards the close of the 4th century A. D. He also identified Prthiviseṇa whose feudatory Vyāghradeva's inscription was found at Nachna, with the first Vākātaka prince of that name. In all these respects his conclusions have been proved to be erroneous.

² I have shown elsewhere that Kālidāsa's play *Mālavikāgnimitra* reflects the matrimonial alliance between the Guptas and the Vākātakas. See my Marathi book, *Kālidāsa*, pp. 144 f. For the historical data in Rājasekhara's *Viddhaśatadhanjaka* and Padmagupta's *Navasahasāṅkacarita*, see my articles in the *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*, Vol. XI, pp. 361 ff. and *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. LXII, pp. 101 ff.

³ See Fargiter, *Dynasties of the Kuli Age*, p. 50.

the Godāvari, but their records have not yet been discovered. They seem to have been crushed out of existence by a Rāstrakūṭa family which rose in Southern Mahārāstra in the last quarter of the 4th century A. D.¹

The eldest branch produced several kings the best known of whom is Pravarasena II, the daughter's son of Candragupta II-Vikramāditya and the reputed author of the Prakrit kāvya *Setubandha*. During the reign of Prthivisena II this branch extended its sway to the north of the Narmadā as some stone inscriptions of this king's feudatory Vyāghradeva, who is plainly identical with the Uchhalpa king Vyāghra, have been found in the Jaso and Ajayagadh States in Central India.² This branch seems to have come to an end soon after Prthivisena II who is the last king known from inscriptions.

The Vatsagulma branch also produced some great kings whose names are known from an inscription in Cave XVI at Ajantā. The last of them known so far was Harisena (A. D. 475-500). He was a very powerful and ambitious ruler. He appears to have annexed Northern Vidarbha after the death of Prthivisena II and either raided or exacted tribute from the rulers of Kuntala, Avantī, Kalinga, Kosalā, Trikūṭa, Lāta and Āndhra.⁴ It was during his reign that three of the most beautiful caves at Ajantā viz. caves XVI, XVII and XIX, as well as the Ghatotkaca cave at Gulwādā were excavated and decorated.

The description of Harisena's conquests in the Ajantā inscription shows that his empire extended beyond the Narmadā in the North and the Kṛṣṇā in the South and from the Arabian sea in the West to the Bay of Bengal in the East. The Vākātaka power crumbled soon after Harisena, for no successor of his is known from inscriptions. The circumstances which caused the sudden downfall of such a powerful empire have not been recorded in

¹ See my article 'The Rāstrakūṭas of Mānapura' in *A. B. O. R. I.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 36 ff.

² Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 233, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XVII, pp. 12 ff.

³ The names of these countries occur in a mutilated verse in ll. 14-15 in the inscription in Cave XVI at Ajantā, in connection with the description of the conquests of Harisena.

⁴ [*Annals*, B. O. R. I.]

history. The eighth chapter of the *Daśakumāracarita*, if properly interpreted, may throw welcome light on this question.¹

The *Daśakumāracarita* names Punyavarman and his son Anantavarman as kings of Vidarbha and Mitravarman as the ruler of Māhīśmatī. All these belonged to the ancient Bhoja race. The ancient history of Vidarbha, known so far, discloses no such dynasty of Varman kings. The Vākātakas, who alone could have been meant here, had their names ending in *śena*. The names of the characters in the *Daśakumāracarita* are therefore purposely changed. Again, the Vākātakas nowhere in their records connect themselves with the ancient Bhoja race. The Cammaka plates² of the Vākātaka king Pravarasena II no doubt mention Bhojakatarājya as a territorial division of Vidarbha, from which Collins has inferred that the Vākātakas called themselves Bhojas and ruled from Bhojakata, but the inference does not appear to be justifiable. It is not however unlikely that the Vākātakas who ruled over Vidarbha, the land of the Bhojas, may have been popularly supposed to be of the Bhoja race. The commentator of the *Setubandha*, has recorded the tradition that Pravarasena, the author of that *Kāvya*, was, according to some, called Bhojadeva.³

The *Daśakumāracarita* mentions several feudatories of Anantavarman and therefore of his father Punyavarman whom we have identified with Harisena. Let us see if any of them are known from other sources to have acknowledged the supremacy of the king of Vidarbha.

1 Vasanṭabhānu of Aśmaka - Aśmaka, as already stated, was the name of the country between the Sātmālā range and the Godāvari river. In the recently discovered Pāṇḍarangapalli plates it is mentioned together with Vidarbha as conquered by Mānanka of the Rāstrakūṭa dynasty and may have been in subordinate

¹ Mark Collins thought that the political condition described in the *Daśakumāracarita* existed before the time of Harisena, for Daṇḍin describes Kuntala as a feudatory kingdom, while in the Ajantā inscriptions it is said to have been conquered by Harisena, which shows that it was independent. See his *Geographical Data* etc., p. 46. The argument does not appear convincing.

² Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, pp. 235 ff.

³ Cf. *Pravarasena Bhojadeva* in *keśi* in the com. on v. 9.

alliance with the former. No records of the ruling family have yet been discovered, but that Āsmaka was ruled as a separate country in the 6th century A. D. is shown by an inscription of that age in Cave XXVI at Ajantā which names two ministers of the rulers of Āsmaka.

2. Avantideva of Kuntala - I have shown elsewhere that contemporary with the Vākātakas there was a dynasty of the Rāstrakūṭas ruling over the country of Kuntala which comprised the upper valley of the Kṛṣṇā. Their capital was Mānapura, modern Mān on the Mān river in the Sātārā District, which was founded by Mānānka, the progenitor of the family. The country of Kuntala was contemporaneous with Vidarbha and therefore its rulers often came into conflict with the Vākātakas of Vatsagulma.¹ The inscription in Cave XVI at Ajantā records two victories of the Vākātakas over the kings of Kuntala, the first during the reign of Sarvasena and the second during that of Harisena.² The king of Kuntala must have been smarting under the defeat inflicted by Harisena and therefore must have welcomed the opportunity to throw off the Vākātaka yoke during the reign of Harisena's weak successor.

3. Ekavīra of Ṛṣika - Ṛṣika, as stated above, was the ancient name of the modern Khandesh District. As I have shown elsewhere³ from some copper-plate grants discovered in Khandesh, there was a feudatory family ruling over this country in the fourth and fifth centuries A. D. Its capital was Valkha which I have identified with Vāghlī near Chālisgaon. A large, but sadly mutilated, inscription in cave XVII at Ajantā mentions a long line of twelve princes which, from their names, appears to have been connected with the family ruling at Vāghlī. The last of these princes, being very much grieved by the death of his younger brother, caused the caves XVII and XIX to be excavated at Ajantā 'while Harisena, the moon among princes, was ruling the earth.' The mention of the Vākātaka ruler clearly indicates that this ruler of Ṛṣika was his feudatory.

¹ See my article 'the Rāstrakūṭas of Mānapura,' *A. B. O. R. I.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 36 ff.

² Mirashi, *Vākātaka Inscription in Cave XVI at Ajantā* (Hyderabad Archaeological Series, No. 14), pp. 4 ff.

³ *A. B. O. R. I.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 159f.

4 Nāgapala of Nāsikya—This prince probably belonged to the royal family of the Traikūtakas who are known from their inscriptions and coins to have held Northern Mahārāstra and Southern Gujarat in the fifth century A. D. The Traikūtakas at first owned the supremacy of the Ābhīras whose era they use in their inscriptions, but later on they became independent, for one of them, Dahrasena, (circa A. D. 450-75) performed an Aśvamedha sacrifice. Harisena claims to have defeated the ruler of Trikūṭa who was probably Vyāghrasena, for a copper-plate grant of the latter is dated K 241 (A. D. 490) Trikūṭa, from which the royal family took its name, was the range of hills which bordered the Nāsik District on the west. The recently discovered Añjaneri plates of Bhogaśakti mention *Pūrva-Trikūṭa-rājya* or 'Eastern Trikūṭa District' which shows plainly that there was a district named after the mountain which divided it into two parts.

5 Kumāragupta of Konkana—The early history of Konkana is still uncertain for want of contemporary inscriptions. The country was occupied by the Sakas and Sātavāhanas in the early centuries of the Christian era, but who succeeded them is not yet definitely known. In K 245 (A. D. 494) Konkana was under the rule of the Traikūtakas, for a copper-plate of that year which was discovered in the Stūpa at Kānheri mentions 'the increasingly victorious rule of the Traikūtakas'. Perhaps the ruler of Konkana, whoever he was, at first owed allegiance to the Traikūtakas, but submitted to the Vākātakas when they vanquished the Traikūtakas.

6 Virasena of Murala—As shown above, the country of Murala may have been situated not far from the bank of the Godāvari, but we have no knowledge of any dynasty ruling there.

We have thus seen that all these feudatories were ruling either to the west or to the south of Vidarbha. Harisena claims to have conquered the eastern kingdoms of Kalinga, Kosala and Āndhra also, but none of these are mentioned in the story probably because they did not join Vasantabhānu's conspiracy. Two of these were probably relatives of the Vākātaka king. The *Daśakumāracarita*

states that Anantavarman's mother was the daughter of the king of Kosala i. e., Daksina Kosala or Chhattisgarh. That the ruler of Kosala had submitted to the Vākātakas is known also from the incomplete Bālāghāt plates of Prthivīśena II. The contemporary ruler probably belonged to the so-called dynasty of Sarabhapura¹ The Āndhra king who may have belonged to the Viṣṇukundin family, was also matrimonially connected with the Vākātakas, for Madhavavarman I who laid the foundation of Viṣṇukundin power, in the Āndhra country, married a Vākātaka princess who was probably a descendant of Harisena himself.

The *Daśakumāracarita* mentions, besides these feudatory states, the kingdoms of Māhismatī and Mālava in the North and that of Vanavāsī in the South. The country of Anūpa of which Māhismatī was the capital, comprised the territory corresponding to the Nemād district of the Central provinces. Of this country too we have little information, but from two copper-plate grants discovered in the Barwāni and Gwalior States² we learn that a king named Subandhu was ruling at Māhismatī in the fifth century A. D. for one of the grants is dated in the (Kalacuri) year 167 (A. D. 416-17). He does not appear to have belonged to the Vākātaka family. Afterwards the country may have been annexed to the Vākātaka dominion and placed under a member of the royal family.

Candavarman of Mālava—This country was then ruled by a very powerful ruler who may have been Yaśodharman of Mandasore, the famous vanquisher of the Hūna king Mihirakula. The Mandasore stone pillar inscription of this king states that his empire extended over a very wide country extending from the Himālayas and the Brahmaputrā in the North of the Arabian Sea and the Mahendra mountain in the South.

Bhānuvarman of Vanavāsī—Vanavāsī, also called Vanjayantī, (modern Banavāsī in the North Kanara District), was the capital

¹ I have shown elsewhere that the so-called kings of Sarabhapura flourished in circa 500-530 A. D., see *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXVI, p. 228.

² *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XIX, pp. 261ff. and *An. Rep.* of the Archaeological Department, Gwalior State for 1928-29, p. 15. The editor of the Barwāni plates refers this date to the Gupta era, but the general resemblance of this grant to those of the kings of Valkha (*A. B. O. R. I.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 162f.) leaves no doubt that like the latter it also is dated in the so-called Kalacuri Cedi era of A. D. 249-50.

of the Kadambas. Kadamba chronology is still uncertain, but that there was a powerful kingdom of the Kadambas in the fifth and sixth centuries A. D. is undeniable. The last king of the main line was Harivarman whose Sāngoli plates seem to have been issued either in A. D. 526 or A. D. 545. His father was Ravivarman who may have been identical with Bhānuvarman¹ mentioned in the *Dakṣakumāracarita*.

The description in the *Dakṣakumāracarita* is thus corroborated in all important details by what we know about the history of the Deccan in the beginning of the sixth century A. D. It clearly suggests that the central power in the Vākātaka Empire became weak and feudatories began to show signs of revolt during the reign of Harisena's weak successor who led a dissolute life. There was chaos and confusion everywhere in the Vākātaka kingdom which ultimately led to an invasion by the Kadambas of Vanavasi at the instigation of the ruler of Asmaka. Owing to the treacherous defection of some other feudatories the Vākātaka king suffered a disastrous defeat and was killed in the fight. The Asmaka king then annexed Vidarbha to his kingdom. As Dandin's narrative ends abruptly, we do not know whether Bhāskaravarman whom we have identified with Harisena's grandson, regained the ancestral throne with external help. But even if he did, he could not have kept it long. And this is what actually happened; for within about fifty years of Harisena's death, Vidarbha was occupied by the Kalacuris who had, in the meanwhile, established themselves at Māhismatī. Silver coins of Kṛṣṇarāja (circa A. D. 550-575), the founder of Kalacuri power, have been discovered in the Amraoti District of Berar and the Betul District of the Central Provinces. From some other indications² also we can infer that Vidarbha was occupied by the Kalacuris during the time of Kṛṣṇarāja.

¹ There was actually a prince named Bhānuvarman of the Kadamba family at this time, but he was not the ruling king as required. He was the brother of the then ruling king Ravivarman. See his Halmi grant dated in the 11th year of Ravivarman's reign. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI, p. 28.

² As I have shown elsewhere (*A. R. O. R. I.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 43) the records of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas who later on established themselves at Acalapura (modern Ellichpur) in Berar, copy certain expressions from the description of Kṛṣṇarāja in the grants of the Kalacuris which plainly shows that Kṛṣṇarāja had occupied Vidarbha.

The foregoing discussion must have made it plain that Dandin's narrative faithfully reflects the actual political situation in the Deccan in the beginning of the sixth century A. D. Such detailed knowledge of the different kingdoms flourishing in that age clearly indicates that Dandin must have lived at a time when the events described by him happened or were at least well remembered.

The date of Dandin has long been a matter of keen controversy. Some have placed him in the sixth century A. D., others in the 9th and some others in the 11th century A. D.¹ As shown above, the political conditions described in the eighth *Ucchvāsa* of the *Dasakumāracarita*, obtained in Vidarbha only in the sixth century A. D. In later centuries the centre of imperial power in the Deccan shifted successively to Māhismati, Bādāmi, Mānyakheta, and Kalyāni but it was never in Vidarbha. Some of the geographical names also went out of use in later times. One such instance is that of Rśka. This country is named in the *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyana*, *Brhatsamhitā* as well as in the Nāsik cave inscription of Pulumāvi, but it is unknown to later works and inscriptions. All these indications point to the conclusion that Dandin must have flourished not long after A. D. 550.

The recently discovered Sanskrit works *Avantisundarikuthā* and *Avantisundarikathāsāra* contained some interesting information about the ancestry and personal history of Dandin, but both these works are unfortunately fragmentary. The latter work, however, states that Dandin was the great-grandson of the Sanskrit poet Dāmodara who was patronised by the Gāṅga king Durvinita and the Pallava ruler Simhaviśnu. Dāmodara must therefore have lived in the last quarter of the sixth century A. D. His great-grandson Dandin can consequently be referred to the third quarter of the seventh century A. D. It has been doubted whether the author of the *Avantisundarikuthā* was identical with Dandin who wrote the *Dasakumāracarita*, but it is conceded even by those who doubt this identity that the biographical details about Dandin given in the aforementioned works may be correct.² Dandin thus may have flourished nearly a hundred years after the fall of the Vākātakas. It is not therefore unlikely that he had fairly reliable information about the last period of Vākātika rule in Vidarbha.

¹ See Agashe's Introduction in his edition of the *Dasakumāracarita* (Bom. Sansk. Series), p. xxxviii. ² See *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, Vol. III, p. 403.

THE NARASIMHA-PURĀṆA

By

R. C. HAZRA

The present *Narasimha-purāṇa*,¹ which is also called *Nṛsimha-* (or *Nārasimha-*) *purāṇa*, is one of the oldest and most important of the extant Vaisnava Upapurāṇas. It begins with a salutation to Narasimha and states that once, in the month of Māgha, some Veda-knowing sages came with their disciples to Prayāga from different parts of India (viz., Himālaya, Naimisāranya, Arbudāranya, Puskarāranya, Mahendia mountain, Vindhya mountain, Dharmāranya, Dandakāranya, Srisaṭa, Kuruksetra, Kaumāra-parvata, Pampā, etc.), had their bath in the holy Ganges, and saw Bharadvāja in his hermitage. When, after mutual greetings, they were engaged in 'talks about Kṛṣṇa' (kṛṣṇāśrītāḥ kathāḥ), there arrived a Sūta named Lomaharsana, who was a disciple of Vyāsa and was versed in the Purāṇas (purāṇajña). After Lomaharsana had been duly received by the sages, Bharadvāja thanked him for having narrated to them the 'Samhitā named Vārāha' (i. e. the *Vārāha-purāṇa*) during the great sacrifice instituted by Saunaka, and then, wishing to hear from him the 'Paurāṇa-samhitā named Nārasimha', put to him the following questions for detailed treatment:

- (1) Whence did this universe, with its moving and stationary objects, originate? Who preserves it? And where will it go after dissolution?
- (2) What is the extent of the earth?
- (3) What acts please Narasimha?
- (4) How does creation begin, and how does it end?
- (5) What are the four Yugas? How are these to be reckoned, and what are their characteristics?
- (6) What will be the condition of people during the Kali age?

¹ See Appendix I, pp. 65-76

- (7) How is Narasimha to be worshipped, and what places, mountains and rivers are sacred to him ?
- (8) How were the gods, Manus, Vidyādhara etc first created ?
- (9) Which kings were sacrificers, and who attained the highest success ?

The Sūta consented to narrate the '*Nārasimhaka Purāna*.' Consequently, he saluted his teacher Vyāsa, through whose favour he learnt the '*Purāna*', and then began to deal with the five Purāna topics (viz., Primary Creation, Secondary Creation, etc) by way of answering all the questions with the narration of various relevant stories. So, the present *Narasimha-p.* deals with the following topics —

Glorification of Narasimha (also called Visnu, Hari, Vāsudeva, Kṛṣṇa, etc.) by identifying him with Nārāyaṇa, the eternal Brahma. Description of the origin of the cosmic egg (anda) from Brahma (i e. Nārāyaṇa) according to the Sāṃkhya system, Visnu's presence as Brahmā in this egg for creation. Division of time into nimesa, kāsthā, kalā, muhūrta, ahorātra (day-and-night), pakṣa (fortnight), māsa (month), ayana, varṣa (year), yuga and kalpa; and the measurement of those divisions with respect to men, Pitṛs, Manus, Brahmā etc. Brahmā's origin from the lotus in Visnu's navel, origin of Rudra from Brahmā's rage, Brahmā's creation of Dakṣa and his wife, from whom Svāyambhuva Manu was born — (chaps 1-3). Origin of the ten sages Marīci, Atri, Angirasa etc. from Brahmā's mind; Brahmā's creation of Śatarūpā who was given in marriage to Manu; creation by the sages except Nārada who was given to Nivṛtti-dharma; creation by Rudra, creation by Dakṣa; the descendants of Dakṣa's daughters. — (chaps 4-5). Description of the Samsāra-vṛkṣa (tree of rebirths) which causes delusion of the mind; praise of Jñāna, Visnu-worship and meditation on Visnu-Brahma as the means of getting rid of all sufferings brought on by rebirths; method and praise of muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra 'om namo nārāyaṇāya' for the purpose. — (chaps 16-18). Enumeration of Āditya's 108 names (including Śambhu, Tvaṣṭṛ, Kapila, Mṛtyu, Hari, Hamsa, Prataḍana, Taraṇi, Mahendra, Varuna, Visnu, Agni etc.) as mentioned by Viśvakarman (chap. 20). 'Short' genealogical

lists of the kings of the solar and the lunar race, the former ending with Budha, (v. l. Buddha in the Dacca University Mss Nos. 2713 and 2844), son of Śuddhodana, and the latter with Kṣemaka, son of Naravāhana and grandson of Udayana and Vāsavadattā (chaps. 22-23) Accounts of the past, present and future Manus and Manvantaras (chap. 24). History of the prominent kings of the solar and the lunar race (vamsānu-carita), especially of those who worshipped Narasimha and performed sacrifices (chaps. 25-29) Geography of the earth (chap. 30). Glorification of the performance of duties towards parents and husband (chap. 14). Glorification of Brahmins and of services rendered to them (chap. 28). Results of giving various articles (chap 30). Method of the worship of Gaṇeśa (chap. 26) Glorification of Narasimha-worship as well as of the different kinds of service rendered to Narasimha and his temple (viz. construction and sweeping of the temple and besmearing it with cow-dung; bathing of the image with pure water, milk, curd, honey etc or with Mantra, offer of various articles, recitation of hymns of praise; presentation of flags marked with the figure of Garuda, songs, musical concerts, or theatrical performances etc. held for Narasimha's pleasure; removal of flowers etc. with which Narasimha has been worshipped, and so on. - (chaps. 32-34). Sins arising out of crossing the flowers etc with which Viṣṇu has been worshipped (chap. 28). The methods of performing Lakṣa-homa and Koti-homa for the good of the village or the town or the country in which these are performed (chaps. 34-35). The method of consecration of the images of Viṣṇu (chap. 56). The Vedic and the popular (sarva-hita) method of Narasimha-(or Viṣṇu-) worship (chaps 62-63). Description of the evils of the Kali age (chap 54). Duties of the four castes and orders of life (varnāśrama-dharma. - chaps. 57-60). Description and praise of Yoga which is to be practised by one who belongs to the fourth order of life (chap 61). Enumeration and praise of rivers and holy places sacred to Viṣṇu (chaps. 65-66). Praise of certain qualities of the mind (chap. 67). Mention and praise of a few Vratas (viz. Eka-bhakta, Nakta, Saura-nakta, Agastyārgha-dāna, etc. - chap. 67). Praise of the *Narasimha-purāṇa* (chap. 68),

In connection with these topics the following stories have been introduced in this Purāṇa, viz

the story of the birth of Vasistha and Agastya from Mitra and Varuna when the latter saw Urvaśī in a lake called Paundarikā in a forest in Kurukṣetra (chap 6): the story of Mārkaṇḍeya who, being destined to die at the age of 12, worshipped Viṣṇu, according to Bhṛgu's advice, with the twelve-syllabled Mantra (om namo bhagavate Vāsudevāya) at Bhadravata on the bank of the river Tunga-bhadrā, with the result that even Death had no influence on him, and when Death and his assistants went to Yama to report how, in their attempt to bring Mārkaṇḍeya to the abode of Yama, they had been beaten back by the Viṣṇu-dūtas, Yama reproached them for their conduct towards the Viṣṇu-dūtas and praised Viṣṇu (also called Vāsudeva and Kṛṣṇa) as the chastiser even of himself (chaps 7-12), the story of Yama, who, though repeatedly tempted by his passionate sister Yamī to incest, did not agree to her proposal and was thus able to attain divinity (chap. 13): the story of a Brahmacārin named Deva-śarman who turned a wandering mendicant after his father's death, began to live at Nandigrāma in Madhyadeśa after visiting numerous holy places, became proud of his occult power by being able to reduce to ashes, by an angry look, a crow and a crane which were carrying away his rag, chanced to meet Sāvitrī, the devoted, and consequently omniscient, wife of a pious and learned Brahman named Kasyapa, and was reproached by her for his pride as well as for his neglect of duties to his mother and forefathers (chap. 14), the story of a learned Brahman, who, after his wife's death, visited numerous holy places, turned a Yati at the advice of Narasimha (who warned him that one, who does not belong to any order of life, is not favoured by him), and attained salvation after death (chap 15) the stories of the birth of the Aśvins and the Maruts, said to have been summarised from those told respectively by Vāyu and by Śakti-putra¹ (i. e. Parāśara)

¹ The printed ed. reads 'śakti-putrēṣa' (see *Nar.* 19, 5), but the Dacca University Mss Nos 2713 (fol. 27a) and 284A (fol. 34b) read 'śakti-putrēṣa'. In the Dacca University Ms No 323, the folios (37-40) containing chaps. 19-27 and verses 1-16 of chap. 28 of the printed ed. are lost.

in the 'Vaisnavākhyā Purāṇa' (chaps. 19-21), the story of Ikṣvāku, who, considering renunciation to be the best way of Viṣṇu-worship, went to the hermitage of Gālava and others after eulogising and worshipping Ganeśa according to Vasistha's instructions, practised severe penance there, and muttered the twelve-syllabled Mantra 'om namo bhagavate vāsudevāya', with the result that Brahmā revealed himself before king Ikṣvāku, told him how, being directed by a voice from the air, he himself could experience Viṣṇu by worshipping this god as well as by performing his own duties, and gave instructions to Ikṣvāku, who accordingly returned to his capital, did his duties as a householder, worshipped the images of Ananta and Mādhava given to him by Brahmā, and attained the region of Viṣṇu (chaps. 25-26). the story of Śāntanu who, though worshipping Narasiṃha according to the method learnt from Nārada, once passed over Narasiṃha-nirmālya (i.e. the flowers etc. with which Narasiṃha was worshipped) and was thus disabled from mounting his divine chariot but who regained his power by clearing the remnants of food of Brahmans for twelve years in Kurukṣetra (chap. 28), the story of Indra's son who used to steal flowers from the garden of a florist named Ravi and was disabled from mounting his chariot in consequence of passing over Viṣṇu-nirmālya, placed by the florist near the garden according to Narasiṃha's instructions, but who got rid of his disability and went to his heavenly residence after clearing the remnants of food of Brahmans for twelve years in Kurukṣetra (chap. 28), the story of Dhruva's attainment of high position among the stars and planets through Narasiṃha's favour attained by means of Viṣṇu-worship as well as by muttering the twelve-syllabled Mantra 'om namo bhagavate vāsudevāya' (chap. 31), the story of the demons Sthūlasiras and Bāhuroman, who disguised themselves as ascetics on the bank of the Revā with a view to carrying away Draupadī, and of whom the former was killed by Bhīma and the latter, when chased by Arjuna, took the form of a four-armed and yellow-robed being with a conch-shell, disc etc. in his hands and narrated to Arjuna how in his previous birth as a Brahman of ill repute he swept the floor of a Viṣṇu-temple and lighted a lamp there for enjoying

the wife of a Brahman, how being beaten to death by the city-guards he attained heaven and remained there for a long time, how he was reborn as king Jayadhvaṇya of the lunar race and rendered service to the Viṣṇu-temple, and how after death he enjoyed various pleasures in the regions of Indra and Rudra and was, on his way to the Brahmāloka, cursed by Nārada to become a demon (chap. 33) the stories of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu (viz., Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Narasimha Vāmana, Paraśurāma, Rāma, Balabhadra, Kṛṣṇa, and Kalki) including the story of Prahlāda (chaps 36-54), the story of Śukra's regaining his eye which was pierced by Vāmana (chap 55); the story of Indra, who muttered the eight-syllabled Mantra and got rid of his female form that was brought on him by the curse of the sage Tinabindu for killing in his hermitage the demoness Dirghajāṅghā who, under the guise of an extremely beautiful woman, acted as a spy to Kuvera whose wife Citrasenā was stolen by Indra (chap. 63), the story of a Brahman named Pundarika, who became a wandering mendicant without entering the second stage of life, settled at Sāligṛāma and became an attendant (pārsada) of Nārāyaṇa by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra (om namo nārāyaṇāya) and meditating on the deity according to the instructions of Nārada who introduced himself as a servant of Vāsudeva (chap 64)

From the above mentioned contents of the present *Narasimha* p. it is clear that this Purāṇa is meant exclusively for the glorification of Narasimha who is identified with Nārāyaṇa (or Viṣṇu) as one of the forms (mūrti) of the latter¹ and is thus called not only Nārāyaṇa but also Viṣṇu, Vāsudeva, Hari, Mādhava, Ananta, Kṛṣṇa,² Dāmodara etc. So Narasimha, though a form of Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu, is himself the principal god also. It is this supreme deity called Nārāyaṇa (or Viṣṇu or Narasimha) who takes the form of Brahmā and Rudra for the sake of creation and destruction respectively, and for the work of preservation he takes the forms of (the inferior) Viṣṇu, Narasimha etc.³ In creation he takes the form of Māyā.⁴ Though in this

¹ Nar. 1, 30, 1, 64-65

² Nar. 1, 10, 7, 37

³ Nar. 1, 30, 2, 1, 1, 61-62 and 64-65, 39, 17b-18b.

⁴ Nar. 3, 28—māyām adhiṣṭhāya sṛjaty anantaḥ.

Purāṇa Viṣṇu (or Nārāyaṇa) is described as four-armed, yellow-robed, having a complexion like that of the cloud, and holding a conch-shell, a disc, a mace and a lotus in his hands, he is called nirvikalpa, nisprapañca, advaita, sarvātmaka, ātma-caitanya-rūpa, jyotiḥ-svarūpa, avyakta-svarūpa, ānanda-rūpa, cidātmaka etc.¹ and identified with the Brahma of Vedānta and the Puruṣa of Sāṃkhya.²

It has already been said that the present *Narasimha-p* is one of the oldest of the extant Vaiṣṇava Upapurāṇas. It was translated into Telugu about 1300 A D³ and is profusely drawn upon by the commentators and Nibandha-writers both early and late. For instance, Gadādhara quotes verses from chap 58 in his *Kūlasāra*, Gopālabhatta from chaps. 8, 9, 18, 28, 32, 33, 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss.), 58 and 66 in his *Haribhakti-vilāsa*, Anantabhatta from chaps 34 and 35 in his *Vidhāna-pārijāta* I. Narasiṃha Vājaṇeyin from chaps 7, 8, 28, 33, 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss.), 58 and 63 in his *Nityācāra-pradīpa*; Raghunandana from chap 62 in his *Durgā-pūjā-tattva* and from chaps 8, 18, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss.), 58, 62, 63, 66 and 67 in his *Smṛti-tattva*, Govindānanda from chaps 30, 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss.), 58, 62 and 67 in his *Varṣa-kauṇḍī*, from chap 58 in his *Śuddha-kauṇḍī* and *Śrūddha-kauṇḍī*, and from chap 30 in his *Dona-kauṇḍī*, Śrināthacārya-cūdāmaṇi from chap 58 in his *Kṛtya-tattvamaṇa*, Vidvākara Vājaṇeyin from chaps. 8, 15, 32, 58 and 63 in his *Nityācāra-pradīpati*, Sūlapāni from chap. 58 in his *Dīpa-kalikā*, Vācaspati-misra from chap 65 in his *Tīrtha-cintāmaṇi*; Mādhavācārya from chaps. 58 and 60 in his commentary on the *Parāśara-smṛti*, Śrīdatta Upādhyāya from chaps 28, 32 and 58 in his *Kṛtyācāra* Madanapāla from chaps 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss.) and 58 in his *Madana-pārijāta*; Hemādri from chaps. 26, 30, 58 and 67 in his *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi*; Vallālasena from chaps. 30, 34 and 58 in his *Dānasāgara*,

¹ Nar 17, 17-18, 21-25 and 27, 1, 61b-62a, 1, 31a; 53, 11, and so on.

² Nar 1, 31a and 36-39, 3, 13, 17, 35a

³ Farquhar, *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, p 349.

Devana-bhaṭṭa from chaps 30, 34, 57 (as occurring in the Dacca University Mss) and 58 in his *Smṛti-candrikā*, and Aparārka from chaps 58, 60 and 63 in his commentary on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* (see Appendix III). In his *Smṛti-tatva* II, pp. 84 and 284 Raghunandana quotes *Nar* 66, 45 and *Nar*. 30, 29-30a not direct from the *Narasimha-p* but from the 'Tirtha-kāṇḍa-lalpataru' and 'Dāna-ratnākara' respectively. Though Vallābhena is very particular about the authenticity of the Purāṇas which he draws upon in his *Dānasāgara*,¹ he utilises the present *Narasimha-p*, without the least shade of doubt as regards its authenticity, antiquity and non-Tantric character. Moreover in 1030 A. D. Alberūnī mentions the *Narasimha-p*. in his first list of eighteen

¹ Interesting information about the Purāṇas is supplied by Vallābhena when, in his *Dānasāgara*, he refers to the contents of a few Purāṇic works by way of explaining why he rejected them partly or wholly. Regarding the *Ādi-purāṇa* he says that though it was well-known for its treatment of gifts divided according to the division of the year, it was slightly touched upon in the *Dānasāgara*, because its contents were already fully utilised in the *Ācāra-sāgara*, the *Bhāgavata*, the *Brahmāṇḍa* and the *Nāradya-purāṇa* did not contain any chapter on gifts and were consequently set aside the *Linga-purāṇa*, whose volume was expanded by the chapters on big donations (mahādāna) contained in the *Matsya-purāṇa* and which was thus no better than a digest on gifts, was not drawn upon, because the substance of its contents was already obtained from other Purāṇas, the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa* was utilised upto the chapters dealing with saptaṁī (-kalpa), while those on the aṣṭamī- and navamī (-kalpa) were rejected on account of their imbibing Tantric influence, the *Viṣṇu-rahasya* and the *Śiva-rahasya*, which were famous among the people, were mere compilations and were consequently not utilised, and though the *Bhaviṣyottara* was famous for its customary laws (or was popularly followed) and did not contradict good customs, it was avoided in the *Dānasāgara* for want of sufficient evidence to prove its authenticity.

Next Vallābhena names a set of Purāṇas rejected by him as spurious, viz. *Tārkeya* (i. e. *Garuda*), *Brāhma*, *Āgneya*, *Vaiṣṇava* consisting of 23000 ślokas, and *Linga* of 6000 ślokas, and in connection with their contents he says that these works dealing with initiation, consecration, ways of salvation for the Tantrika, testing of gems, fictitious genealogies, lexicography, grammar etc. and containing irrelevant and contradictory statements, were used as means of deception by Mīṣa-ketanav (followers of Mīṣanūṭha) and others, who were hypocrites, heretics and pseudo-ascetics. By his remark that due to its wide circulation the *Skanda-purāṇa* existed in more parts than one, and that three of its parts dealt with the accounts (kathā) of Pauṇḍra, Revā and Avantī, Vallābhena seems to include those three parts among the spurious Purāṇas. See *Dānasāgara*, fol. 3b-4a.

'Purāṇas' which was dictated to him.¹ These show that by the end of the tenth century A. D. the *Narasimha-p.* attained such prominence that its authenticity as an ancient 'Purāṇa' was not at all questioned. Hence this Purāṇa must have been written not later than 800 A. D.

The mention of a 'Vārāhakhya Samhitā' or 'Vārāha' in the *Narasimha-p.* must not be taken to point to the extant *Varāha-p.* and thus be used as an evidence for the late date of the present *Narasimha*. In *Nar* 1, 14-15 Bharadvāja says, "O Sūta, the Samhitā named Vārāha has already been heard from you by these (sages) and ourselves during the great sacrifice of Śaunaka; at present these sages and myself want to hear from you the Paurāṇa-samhitā named Nārasimha"²; and in *Nar* 31, 10b-11a Sūta says in connexion with geography, "The region of Viṣṇu is situated at a distance double in comparison with that of the region of Brahmā; its glories have been described in the Vārāha by those who think over the (different) regions"³. From these it is clear that the *Narasimha-p.* speaks of a *Varāha-p.* which was narrated by Sūta to the sages Bharadvāja and others during the great sacrifice of Śaunaka and which dealt, among other topics, with the praise of the region of Viṣṇu. But in the present *Varāha-p.* there is no mention of Śaunaka's great sacrifice as the occasion of the narration of the Purāṇa or of Bharadvāja as one of the interlocutors, nor does this Purāṇa deal

¹ Sachau, *Albertini's India*, Vol I, p. 30.

This list consists of the following 'Purāṇas' *Ādi-p.*, *Matṛya-p.*, *Kūrma-p.*, *Varāha-p.*, *Narasimha-p.*, *Vāmana-p.*, *Vāyu-p.*, *Nanda-p.*, *Skanda-p.*, *Āditya-p.*, *Soma-p.*, *Sāmba-p.*, *Brahmānda-p.*, *Mārkanḍeya-p.*, *Turkya-p.*, *Viṣṇu-p.*, *Brahma-p.* and *Bhaviṣya-p.*

² In *Nar* 31, 11a the printed ed. reads 'varāhō', but the Dacca University Mss read 'vārāhe' in the corresponding line. See footnote 4 below.

³ *bharadvāja uvāca* :

śaunakesya mahāsatre vārāhakhya tu samhitā :

tvattah śrutā purā sūta etair asmābhir eva ca ||

sāhprataṁ nārasimhakhyaṁ tvattah purāṇa-samhitām :

śrotum icchāmy ahaṁ sūta śrotukāmā ime sītātā || *Nar.* 1, 14-15

⁴ brāhma-lokād viṣṇu-loko dviguṇe ca vyavasthitāh :

varāhe tasya mātmyam kathitāh loka-śatākāh || *Nar.* 31, 10b-11a.

The Dacca University Mss Nos 2713 (fol 41b), 323 (fol. 47a) and 284A (fol. 54a) read 'vārāhe' for 'varāhe'. The former two Mss read 'yoga-śatākāh' for 'loka-śatākāh'.

with the glories of the Viṣṇu-loka. So, the *Varāha-p.* mentioned in the *Narasimha-p.* must have been different from the extant *Varāha*, which was thus unknown to the present *Narasimha-p.* The original chapters of the extant *Varāha-p.* being written about 800 A. D., the date of the present *Narasimha-p.* must be placed earlier.

The verses common to the *Narasimha-p.* and the present *Varāha* in their chapters on primary and secondary creation¹ need not be taken to prove the indebtedness of one of these two Purāṇas to the other. These common verses must have been taken by these two Purāṇas from the earlier *Varāha-p.* which is now extinct.

In chaps. 26, 33 (verses 1-14), 34, 35, 56, 62 and 63 (verses 1-9 and 199-222) the *Narasimha-p.* gives the method of Gaṇeśa-worship, the Vedic and popular methods of Viṣṇu-worship, the method of consecrating the images of Viṣṇu, and the procedure to be followed in the performance of Lakṣa-homa and Kotī-homa. But neither in these chapters nor anywhere else in the whole Purāṇa there is the slightest trace of Tantric influence. This Purāṇa does not mention the Tantriks or the Tantras even for the sake of denouncement. So, it is evident that this Purāṇa was composed at a time when the Tantras did not begin to influence the people very seriously. Now, from an examination of the Mahāpurāṇas we have seen that Tantric influence began to be imbibed by the Purāṇic works from about 800 A. D.² Hence the *Narasimha-p.* must be dated not later than 700 A. D.

Though in chap. 36 of the *Narasimha-p.* Mārkaṇḍeya promises to narrate the stories on the following (eleven) incarnations of Viṣṇu, viz., Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Narasimha, Vāmana,

¹ <i>Narasimha-p.</i>	<i>Varāha-p.</i> (ASB ed.)	<i>Narasimha-p.</i>	<i>Varāha-p.</i> (ASB ed.)
1, 17, 19-20a and 23a	= 1, 12-15a	3, 10b	= 2, 21a
1, 32-33	= 2, 3-4	3, 11-28b	= 2, 23-41a
1, 35-36a	= 2, 5-6	4, 1-6	= 2, 42-47
3, 1-9a	= 2, 13-20	5, 5a and 6b-8a	= 2, 49-50

² See Hazra, *Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, p. 260.

Parasurāma, Rāma,¹ Balarāma, Kṛṣṇa, Buddha and Kalki, he gives, in chaps. 37-54, the stories on all these except the Buddha and adds at the end, "I have spoken on the ten incarnations of (Viṣṇu) the destroyer of (all) earthly sins. The devotee of Nṛsiṃha, who always listens to these, attains Viṣṇu" (Nar. 54, 6). So the only line 'kalau prāpte yathā buddho bhaven nārāyaṇaḥ prabhuḥ' (Nar. 36, 9a), which mentions the Buddha incarnation, is undoubtedly spurious. This line does not occur in the Dacca University Mss (Nos. 2713, 323 and 284A) of the *Narasimha-p*. Thus the *Narasimha-p* knows the group of the 'ten' incarnations of Viṣṇu but is quite ignorant of the Buddha incarnation. An examination of the different lists of incarnations of Viṣṇu shows that the Buddha began to be regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu from about 550 A. D.² Hence the date of the *Narasimha-p* is to be placed not later than about 550 A. D.

According to the *Narasimha-p* Kṛṣṇa embodies only a part of Viṣṇu's Śakti.³ It is for this inferior position of Kṛṣṇa that Yama says in Nar. 9, 3, "I submit to the slayer of (the demon) Madhu, even Kṛṣṇa is not able to restrain me of his own accord." Hence the *Narasimha-p* is to be dated earlier than the present *Bhāgavata*, in which Kṛṣṇa is given a higher position and is even called the Bhagavat himself.⁴ As the present *Bhāgavata* is to be dated in sixth century A. D.⁵ the *Narasimha-p* is to be placed not later than 500 A. D.

¹ In the present ed. the verse (no. 7) on the Rāma incarnation is placed before the line (no. 9a) on Parasurāma, but in the Dacca University Mss (Nos. 2713, 323 and 284A) this order has been reversed.

² See Hazra, *Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs* pp. 41-42.

³ See Nar. 53, 30b-31a (avatīrya mahātale 'sita-kṛṣṇe ca macchakti kamaśūdrin ghṛṣṭayasyataḥ"), 33a (prasayāmāsa te śaktiḥ sita-kṛṣṇe svake nṛpa) and 66a (itthau hi śaktiḥ sita-kṛṣṇa rūpe harer anantasya mahābalaśchhye).

⁴ Cf. *Bhāgavata-p* 1, 3, 38a-ete cāmśa-kalāḥ pūṃśaḥ kṛṣṇas tu bhagavan svayam.

⁵ As there are a few parallels in idea as well as language between the works of Saṅkaraśāstrīya and the present *Bhāgavata-p*, some scholars are inclined to date the *Bhāgavata* after that great Vedāntist scholar (See *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, II, pp. 129-130). But these scholars overlook the facts that the present *Bhāgavata*, like the other Purāṇic works, has been revised and amended on more occasions than one, and that Saṅkaraśāstrīya's influence must be due to these revisions and emendations. On the other hand, there are evidences to prove the pre-Saṅkara origin of earlier portions of the present *Bhāgavata*. (See Hazra, *Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, pp. 52-57).

Thus we get the lower limit of the date of this Purāṇa.

Again, in *Narasimha-p.*, chaps. 47-52, a summary of the contents of the *Rāmāyana* is given in connection with the Rāma incarnation of Viṣṇu, *Nar.* 29, 3 mentions some of the notable incidents of the *Mahābhārata*, viz., Arjuna's receipt of the Pāśupata weapon from Śamkara and the assistance given by him to Agni in consuming the Khāṇḍava forest, the Pāṇḍavas' residence *mcoṇḍito* with Draupadi in Virāṭa's capital, and so on; and in *Nar.* 29, 6 Janamejaya is said to have heard the entire *Mahābhārata* from Vaiśampāyana a student of Vyāsa, in order to get rid of the sin arising out of killing a Brahman (brahma-hatyā).¹ Thus the *Narasimha-p* knows both the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mahābhārata* In *Nar.* 19, 5-6 Sūta says to Bharadvāja, "O high-minded one, the origin of the Maruts has already been described elaborately by the son of Śakti (i.e. by Parāśara) in the Purāṇa named Vaisnava, and the creation of the twin gods Aśvins has been narrated in minute details by Vāyu. I shall speak to you briefly on this creation. Listen to me." Thus the *Narasimha-p* mentions two Purāṇas, of which the second is decidedly the present *Vāyu-p.*, which contains the story of the birth of the Aśvins in chap. 84 and is declared by Vāyu.² but the information regarding the 'Vaiṣṇavākhya Purāṇa' in which Śakti's son (Parāśara) was the narrator of the story of the birth of the Maruts, does not tally fully with the present *Viṣṇu-p.* which, though narrated by Parāśara, does not contain this story. But this absence of the story of the birth of the Maruts in the present text of the *Viṣṇu-p.* must not be taken very seriously, because it can be explained away by saying that

¹ sūta uvāca ||
marutāṃ viśtareṇoktā vaiṣṇavākhya mahāmata |
purāṇe śakti-putreṇa puroḥpattīś ca vāyunā ||
aśvinor devayoaṃ caiva sṛṣṭir uktā svistarāt |
saṃkṣepāt tava vakṣyāmi sṛṣṭim etāṃ śṛṇusva me || *Nar.* 19, 5-6.

The Dacca University Mss Nos. 2714 and 284A read 'śakti-putreṇa' for 'śakti-putrena'. Dacca University Ms. No 323 has lost chaps. 19-27 and verses 1-16 of chap 28.

² This identity seems to be supported by the verses common to the *Vāyu* and the *Narasimha-p.*, viz.,

Vāyu-p. 6, 60-65 of *Nar.* 3, 23-28a,
" 2, 75ff. of " 5, 3ff.

the particular Ma or recension of the present *Viṣṇu-p.* which was used by the *Narasimha-p* contained the above mentioned story, and also because there are verses common to the *Narasimha* and the *Viṣṇu-p*.¹ Hence the *Narasimha-p* must be dated later than the present *Vāyu-p* and *Viṣṇu-p*. That the *Narasimha-p* was composed later than the *Viṣṇu-p* is shown by another piece of evidence. In the *Viṣṇu-p* two hairs of Viṣṇu, one black and the other white, are said to have been incarnated as Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma respectively.² Thus Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma are incarnations of exceedingly small portions of Viṣṇu. But in the *Narasimha-p* it is two Śaktis of Viṣṇu, one black and the other white, which appear in the forms of Kṛṣṇa and (Bala-) Rāma respectively for the destruction of Kamsa and others.³ So the position of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma as incarnations of Viṣṇu is better in the *Narasimha-p* than in the *Viṣṇu*. Now, the present *Vāyu-p*, with the exception of those of its chapters which were added later, being earlier than the present *Viṣṇu-p*, and the *Viṣṇu-p* being to be dated about 300 A. D., the date of the *Narasimha-p* should be placed not earlier than about 400 A. D. This upper limit of the date of the present *Narasimha-p* is supported by its mention of week-days (viz., Aika-divasa and Guru-vara) in chap. 67 (verses 8 and 10 respectively), because the earliest epigraphic mention of a week-day is found in the Eran inscription of 484 A. D.⁴

Thus the date of the present *Narasimha-p* is to be placed between 400 and 500 A. D. It is highly probable that this Purāṇa was written in the latter half of this century.

¹ For instance,

<i>Narasimha-p</i>		<i>Viṣṇu-p</i>
3, 23-28a		cf I, 5, 18-24
3, 38	=	I, 8, 1b-2, 7, 3ff.
25, 40b-41a	=	I, 6, 39.

² See *Viṣṇu-p.* V 1, 59-60—*evam saṁstūyamānas tu bhagavān paramēśvaraḥ : ujjahārātmanah keśau sita-kṛṣṇau mahāmune || uvāca ca surān etau mat-keśau varuḍhī-tale : avatīrya bhuvo bhāra-kleśa-hānīm kariṣyataḥ*.

³ *Nar* 53, 30b-31a, 32-34a and 66. For the texts of these verses see footnote 19 above.

⁴ Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, pp. 88-89.

The introductory verses of the *Narasimha-p.* do not throw any light on the date of this Purāna. As all the Mss do not agree in this respect, some of these introductory verses may be later additions. Moreover, the date of these verses is uncertain. The verses 'kim kim simhas tatah kim' is ascribed to Vyasa in the *Kavindra-vacana-samuccaya* (ed. Bibl. Ind., p. 13) and Śrīdhara-dāsa's *Sadukti-karṇāmṛta* (ed. Bibl. Ind., p. 53), and thus seems to have been taken from the *Narasimha-p.*

That a *Narasimha-p.* was written at a fairly early date is shown not only by its mention in all the lists of Upapurānas¹ but also by the *Matsya-p.* (53, 59) which says that the Upapurānas viz., *Nārasimha*, *Nandi-purāna*, *Sāmba* and *Aditya*, were 'well-established in society' (lokesampratisthitāḥ), thus testifying to a much earlier date of these Upapurānas. But it is very difficult to say whether our present *Narasimha-p.* is the same as that mentioned in these lists and in the *Matsya-p.* The commentators and the Nibandha-writers are, however, quite sure of the identity of the two. Of these, Narasimha Vājaṣeyin even explains the shorter form of the present *Narasimha-p.* saying, "As the number (of ślokaś) of the famous *Nārasimha* is not found to be 18000, it seems that a portion has been lost in course of time."²

The above date of the present *Narasimha-p.* must not be taken to be that of the entire Purāna as found in the printed edition, because in the printed edition there are chapters and verses which are decidedly later interpolations. In order to be able to find out these spurious portions a list of such chapters and verses as are not found in all the Mss of the *Narasimha-p.* is given below with the mention of those Mss in which they occur and also of those in which they are not found.

¹ For these lists and the date or formation of the group, see *ABORI*, Vol. XXI, pp. 38 ff.

² *Nityācāra-pradīpa*, p. 18—prasiddha-nārasimhasya aṣṭādaśasāhakra-saṁkhyā yady api nopalabhyate kiṁcīt kāla-kramāt lupṭam iti pratibhāṣa.

Chaps. and verses of the printed ed.	Mss. in which they are not found.	Mss. in which they occur.
1. Chap. 31, verses 1-97. (On the story of Dhruva)	(1) Ms noticed by R. L. Mitra (2) Aufrecht's Ms (3) Koith's Ms (Cat No 6618) (4) Dacca University Mss Nos 2713, 323, 284A (5) R. L. Mitra's Bikaner Ms (6) Ms ग used in the printed ed. Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss, Cat Nos. 6616-17, (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sanskrit College Mss ?	Mss क and ख used in the printed ed.
2. Chap 33, verses 15-85, chap. 34, verse 1 (On the story of the Pāṇavas' killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlasiras).	(1) Ms noticed by Mitra (2) Aufrecht's Mss (3) Dacca University Mss Nos 2713, 323, 284A. (4) Mitra's Bikaner Ms (5) Ms ग used in the printed ed Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss, (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sans. College Mss ?	Mss क and ख used in the printed ed
3 Chap. 34, verses 43-55a. (On Lakṣa-homa and Koṭi-homa)	Ms ग used in the printed ed.	All other Mss.

- 4 Chap. 36, verse 9a. (On the Buddha incarnation).
- (1) Dacca Univ Mss Nos. 2713, 323, 284A.
- (Most probably also in the Mss of Mitra, Aufrecht, Eggeling, Keith, Shastri and Calcutta Sans College; otherwise the number of incarnations becomes 11 and not 10 as mentioned in *Nar.* 54, 6-daśāvatārāḥ kathitāstavaiva harer mayā etc).
5. Chap. 40, verses 60b-61b, chaps. 41-43; chap 44, verses 1-13 (On the story of Prahlada.)
- (1) Ms noticed by Mitra.
- (2) Aufrecht's Mss.
- (3) Dacca Univ Mss Nos. 2713, 323, 284A
- (4) Mitra's Bikaner
- (5) Ms ग used in the printed ed
- Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss, (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sans College Mss ?
- 6 Chap. 54, verses 8-61. (On the evils of the Kali age,)
- (1) Ms noticed by Mitra
- (2) Aufrecht's Mss.
- (3) Dacca Univ. Mss Nos. 2713, 323, 284A
- Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss, (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sans. College Mss ?
- Mss क, ख and also ग (?) used in the printed ed.
- Mss क and ख used in the printed ed.
- Mss क and ख used in the printed ed.

7. Chap. 61.
(On Yoga)
- (1) Aufrecht's Mss (1) Ms. noticed by Mitra
(2) Mss. क and ख used in the printed ed. (2) Dacca Univ. Mss Nos 2713, 323, 284A.
(3) Ms ग used in the printed ed
Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss, (2) Keith's Mss, (3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sans College Mss ?
- 8 Chap. 63, verses 10-119a
(On the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra.)
- (1) Dacca Univ Mss. Nos 2713 and 323 (1) Eggeling's Ms (Cat No 3378
(In the Dacca Univ Ms No 284A chap 57, verses 21-30 and chaps 58-64 of the printed ed do not occur at all) In its comparatively modern portion)
(2) Mss क and ख used in the printed ed
(2) Ms ग used in the printed ed.
Most probably also in
(1) Ms noticed by Mitra,
(2) Aufrecht's Mss
Also in (1) Eggeling's Mss,
(2) Keith's Mss,
(3) Shastri's ASB Mss, and (4) Calcutta Sans College Mss ?

9. Chap. 64.

(On the interlocution between Nārada and Pundarika on the glories of Nārāyaṇa.)

(1) Ms noticed by Mitra

(2) Eggeling's Ms.

(3) Dacca Univ. Ms Nos. 2713 and 323

(In Dacca Univ. Ms No. 284A chap. 57, verses 21-30 and chaps 58-64 of the printed ed. do not occur at all)

Also in (1) Keith's Ms, (2) Shastri's ASB Ms, and (3) (3) Calcutta Sans College Ms?

(1) Aufrecht's Ms.

(2) Eggeling's Ms. (Cat. No. 3378. In its modern portion.)

(3) Ms ॐ, ॐ and ॐ used in the printed ed.)

10. Chap. 65

(On the 68 holy places of the Vaisnavas).

(1) Aufrecht's Ms No 138.

(2) Ms ॐ and ॐ used in the printed ed

(1) Ms noticed by Mitra.

(2) Aufrecht's Ms No 139.

(3) Eggeling's Ms

(4) Dacca Univ Ms Nos 2713, 323, 284A.

(5) Ms ॐ used in the printed ed

Also in (1) Keith's Ms, (2) Shastri's ASB Ms, and (3) Calcutta Sans College Ms (especially in Ms No 36)?

11. Chap. 66
(On the praise of
holy places.)
- (1) Aufrecht's Ms. No. 138.
(2) Dacca Univ. Ms No. 284A.
(3) Calcutta Sans College Ms No 298.
(4) Mss क and ख used in the printed ed.
- (1) Ms. noticed by Mitra.
(2) Aufrecht's Ms No. 139
(3) Eggeling's Ms.
(4) Dacca University Mss Nos. 2713, 323
(5) Shastri's ASB Mss (especially Cat. No 4076.)
(6) Ms ग used in the printed ed
Also in (1) Keith's Mss, and (2) Calcutta Sans College Ms No 36
12. Chap 67.
(On the mental Tir-
thas, and the praise
of the *Narasimha-p.*)
- (1) Aufrecht's Ms No 138
(2) Dacca Univ Ms No 284A
(3) Calcutta Sans College Ms No 298
(4) Mss क and ख used in the printed ed
- (1) Ms noticed by Mitra.
(2) Aufrecht's Ms No 139
(3) Eggeling's Ms
(4) Dacca Univ Mss Nos 2713, 323
(5) Ms ग used in the printed ed
13. Chap 68
(On the praise of
the *Narasimha-p.*).
- (1) Ms noticed by Mitra
(2) Eggeling's Ms (Cat Nos 3375-77)
(3) Dacca Univ. Mss Nos. 2713, 323, 284A.
(4) Calcutta Sans college Mss (Nos 36, 298)
(5) Ms ग used in the printed ed Also in (1) Keith's Mss, and (2) Shastri's ASB Mss?

The above table shows that the following chapters, which are not contained in the older and better Mss, are undoubtedly spurious, viz ,

chap. 31, verses 1-97	on the story of Dhruva,
chap. 33, verses 15-85	on the story of the Pāndavas' killing the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlasīras,
chap. 36, verse 9a	on the Buddha incarnation,
chap. 40, verses 60b-61b,	} on the story of Prahlāda,
chaps 41-43,	
chap. 44, verses 1-13	
chap. 54, verses 8-61	
chap. 63, verses 10-119a	on the evils of the Kali age,
	on the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra,
chap. 64	on the interlocution between Nārada and Iṇḍarika on the glories of Nārāyana,
chap. 68	on the praise of the <i>Narasimha-p.</i> ;

whereas the following chapters, viz ,

chap. 34 (verses 43-55a)	on Lakṣa-homa and Koti-homa,
chap 61	on Yoga,
chap. 65	on the 68 holy places of the Vaisnavas,
chap 66	on praise of holy places,
and chap 67	on the mental Tīrthas, and the praise of the <i>Narasimha-p.</i> ,

though eliminated in some Mss, are genuine.

The spurious character of the chapters and verses of the former group is also shown by their position, by the nature of their insertion, as well as by other evidences. For instance, the story of Dhruva in chap. 31, verses 1-97 is inserted so abruptly that none can have the slightest doubt regarding the fact that verses 98-113 of chap. 31 are direct continuations of the verses in chap. 30. As a matter of fact, chap 30 and verses 98-113 of chap. 31 of the printed ed form a single chapter in the Dacca Univer-

sity Mss.' Similarly, the story of the Pāṇḍavas' killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlaśiras in chap. 33 (verses 15-85) and chap. 34 (verse 1) separate verses 1-14 of chap. 33 and verses 2 ff of chap. 34 of the printed ed. which deal with the results of offering different articles to Viṣṇu and of rendering various kinds of service to this deity and which thus rightly form a single chapter in the Dacca University Mss. Regarding the spurious character of verse 9a of chap 36 much has already been said in connection with the determination of the date of this Purāṇa. As to the chapters on the story of the Prahlaḍa, they are placed between verses 1-60a of chap. 40 and verses 14ff. of chap 44 of the printed ed which form one single chapter in the Dacca University Mss as well as in the Ms ॥ used in the printed edition. In these Mss, those verses, which are separated, with modifications, by the chapters on the story of Prahlaḍa in the printed ed, read, with slight variations, as follows.

gacchadhvam adhunā devāḥ svasthānam vigata-jvarāḥ	
aham adya gamisyāmi indrasyendratva-siddhaye	
hiranya-kaśīpor nāśo bhavatām api vṛddhaye	
yusmākam vijayāyaiva ajayāya sura-dviśām	
mārkaṇḍeya uvāca	
ity uktā viṣṇunā devā natvā viṣṇum yayur nrpaḥ	
bhagavān api deveśo nārasimham athākaroḥ	
bahu-yojana-vistīrnam bahu-yojanam ayatam	
atiraudram mahākāyam dānavānām bhayamkaram	
mahānetram mahavaktram mahādamstram mahānakham	
mahābāhum mahāpādam kālāgni-sadsopamam	
kṛtvettham nārasimham tu yayau viṣṇus trivikramah	
atūyamāno muni-gaṇair hiraṇya-kaśīpoḥ purah	
nṛsimhas tatra gatvā ca mahānādam nanāda ca	
tan-nāda-śṛavanād daityā nārasimham avestayan	
tān hatva sakalāms tatra sva-paurusa-parākramāt	
babhañja ca sabhām divyām hiraṇya-kaśīpor nrpa	
etc.	etc

How these verses have been changed in the printed edition in order to accommodate the chapters on the story of Prahlaḍa will

¹ As we have not been able to consult the other Mss of the *Narasimha-*
pu., we refer only to the Dacca University Mss.

be obvious from a comparison of these verses with *Nar.* 40, 60ff and 44, 14 ff. The word 'yayau' in the line 'kr̥tvettham nārasimham tu yayau visnus trivikramaḥ' which has been retained in the printed edition, does not agree with what has been said of Visnu in the story of Prahlāda. As regards the spuriousness of chap. 68 it can be said that the *Narasimha-p.* really ends with chap. 67, which deals not only with mental Tīrthas but also with the praise of the Purāna, and of which lines 24b-25a say, "Having heard (the Purāna topics) in company with the Snātakas (i. e. the sages who took their holy bath in the Ganges), Bharadvāja remained there after showing proper respect to Sūta, but the (other) sages went away". Further, though in several places of the *Narasimha-p.* unswerving (acalā, avyabhicārinī) Bhakti is mentioned and praised as the means of attaining the blissful state of existence,¹ it is only in some of those chapters which we have taken as spurious that there are mention and praise of Dāsyabhakti.² It is also noteworthy that none of these spurious chapters is referred to by any of the remaining chapters, though there are numerous cross references in the latter.³

¹ See *Nar.* 7, 33, 9, 6, 10 40 and 51, 11, 56 and 60, 32, 10, and so on

² Cf. prahlādo'bravīd dhīmān deva janmāntareṣv apti
dāsaḥ tavāham bhūyāsaḥ garuṁśān iva bhaktimān ||

Nar. 43, 78b-79a.

dāso ham vāseudevasya deva-devasya śārṅgiṇaḥ |
ityukto nārādenāsaḥ bhakti-paryākulāṁśman || *Nar.* 64, 46,

janmāntara-sahasreṣu yasya syād buddhir idrē |
dāso'ham vāseudevasya deva-devasya śārṅgiṇaḥ |

prayāti visnu-sālokyān puruso nātra samśayaḥ || *Nar.* 64, 94-95a.
Also cf. *Nar.* 64, 116-117

In *Nar.* 33, 31 the demon Bahuroman says how in one of his previous births as a Brahman named Raivata, he was killed by the city-guards in a Visnu-temple and was taken to heaven in a car which was 'prabhu-dāsa-samanvita'.

³ *Nar.* 6, 2 refers to *Nar.* 5, 2, *Nar.* 19, 4 refers to *Nar.* 5, 46-47, *Nar.* 20, 1 refers to *Nar.* 19, 23, *Nar.* 24, 1 (prathamam tāvāt svāyambhuvam manvantaram tat-svarūpam kathitam) refers to *Nar.* 3, 8-9 and *Nar.* 5, 20 ff., *Nar.* 24, 17c (pūrvoktāś chāyāyām utpanno manuh. . .) refers to *Nar.* 19, 13 and 15, *Nar.* 29, 9b (tasya caritam aparīṣṭād bhaviṣyati) refers to *Nar.* 32 ff., *Nar.* 32, 1 refers to *Nar.* 29, 9, *Nar.* 32, 1-2 and 8 refer to chap. 36 ff. (on incarnations of Visnu), *Nar.* 35, 2 refers to *Nar.* 34, 47 (on Koṭi-homa), *Nar.* 36, 1 refers to *Nar.* 32, 1-2 and 8, *Nar.* 55, 1 refers to *Nar.* 45, 35-36, *Nar.* 62, 2 refers to *Nar.* 58, 92b-93a. The words 'kā vāvasthā kalau yuge' in *Nar.* 1, 20a refers to *Nar.* 54, 1-6 and not to the section on 'kālyuga-lakṣaṇa' occurring in *Nar.* 54, 8-61.

The above table further shows that there were distinct stages in the process of addition and elimination of chapters and verses. For instance, Ms ग (used in the printed ed.) interpolates chaps. 36 (verse 9a), 54 (verses 8-61) and 64, but eliminates nothing, Dacca University Ms No 284A interpolates nothing but eliminates chap. 66 and 67, and Aufrecht's Ms No. 139 interpolates chaps 64 and 68 and eliminates chap 61. Aufrecht's Ms No. 138 not only combines all the interpolations and eliminations of the Dacca University Ms (No 284A) and Aufrecht's Ms. No 139 but also eliminates one chapter more, viz, chap 65. Mss क and ख (used in the printed ed) go a step further not only by combining all the interpolations and eliminations of Ms ग and Aufrecht's Ms No. 138 but also by interpolating chaps. 31 (verses 1-97), 33 (verses 15-85), 40 (verses 60b-61b), 41-43, 44 (verses 1-13) and 63 (verses 10-119a)

Even among the chapters other than those which have been differentiated above as spurious, there are some which are most probably comparatively late additions. Such chapters are especially *Nar* 6 (on the story of the birth of Vasistha and Agastya as sons of Mitra and Varuna) and *Nar* 7-18 (on the story of Mārkaṇḍeya, the story of Yama and Yamī, etc. narrated by Vyāsa to Śuka) In *Nar* 5, 48 ff. the names of those 13 daughters of Dakṣa who were given in marriage to Kaśyapa, are the following — Aditi, Diti, Danu, Aristā, Svarasā, Svasā, Surabhi, Vinatā, Tāmrā, Krodha-vasā, Irā, Kadrū and Muni; but in *Nar* 6, 4-8 the list of the names of the '13 daughters' married to Kaśyapa omits Aristā and Tāmrā but adds Kālā, Muhūrtā, Simbikā and Saramā, thus increasing the number to fifteen. Even in the Dacca University Mss the names of these '13 daughters' are different from those given in chap. 5.¹ It is to be noted that in *Nar* 5, 43 Muhūrtā is said to have been

¹ The text of verses 6b-7 of chap 6, as given in the Dacca University Mss, is as follows

aditir ditiḥ danuḥ kālā (Ms 284A - kālī) muhūrtā simbikā munīḥ
vrātā (Ms 2713 - tāmrā) krodhā ca surabhir vinatā surasā (Ms
2713 - after marginal correction - sarasā) tathā (Ms
2713 - khaśā) ;

kadrū ca svarasā (Ms 248A omits the word 'svarasā' with a blank space) caiva yā tu devī suṇī tathā (Ms 323 - devī śuṇī smṛtā) ;

given in marriage to Dharma. This disagreement between chap 5 (which deals with Pratisarga and cannot, therefore, be spurious) and chap. 6 seems to indicate the spurious character of the latter. In order to introduce this chapter the interpolator adds verse 2 (mitrā-varuna-putratvam vasisthasya katham bhavet etc) of chap. 5. It is, however, not improbable that only verses 6-8a (containing the names of the '13 daughters') are spurious, and not the entire chap. 6. As to the chaps. 7-18 (on the story of Mārkaṇḍeya, etc.), their introductory verse is as follows:

mārkaṇḍeyena muninā katham mrtyuḥ parājitaḥ |
etad ākhyāhi me sūta tvayaitat sūcitam purā ||

Though in chaps 1-6 of the printed ed there is no verse containing the mention of Mārkaṇḍeya or of the way of his subduing Death, the expression 'tvavaitat sūcitam purā' refers to the verses

bhrgoḥ khyātyām samutpannā lakṣmīr viṣṇu-parigrahaḥ |
tathā dhātā-vidhātārau khyātyām jātāu sutāu bhrgoḥ ||
āyatir niyatīś caiva meruḥ kanye suśobhanaḥ |
dhātur vidhātus ca te bhārye tayor jātāu sutāv ubhau ||
prāṇaś caiva mrkaṇḍeś ca mārkaṇḍeyo mrkaṇḍutah |
yena mrtyur jito vipra purā nārāyaṇāśrayāt ||

which occur among those 12 verses which have been lost after verse 31 of chap. 5 of the printed ed but are found in chap 5 of the Dacca University Mss. Hence the absence of the verse containing the mention of Mārkaṇḍeya in chaps. 1-6 of the printed ed is no cause for taking chaps 7-18 as spurious. These chapters are considered as interpolated, because Nar. 19, 4 refers to Nar 5, 46-47 ignoring the intervening chaps 7-18 and because Mārkaṇḍeya, who is called the great grandson of Bhrgu in the lost verses mentioned above, is mentioned as Bhrgu's grandson in chaps 7-12¹. Of these twelve intervening chapters (7-18), chaps. 7-12 (dealing with the story of Mārkaṇḍeya) differ from chaps 13-18 in certain matters. In the former six chapters (7-12) the use of the twelve-syllabled Mantra 'om namo bhagavate vāsudevāya' is prescribed more

¹ See Nar. 7, 10-12, 25, 27 etc., 8, 3 and 10, 9, 13, 12, 65.

than once; the name 'Kṛṣṇa' for Viṣṇu (also called Nārāyaṇa) is given on many occasions; and the names 'Devaki-nandana', 'Vāsudeva' etc. also are found. Once Yama says,

"sugatim abhīśāmi vāsudevād aham api bhāgavate
sthītāntarātmā |
madhu-vadha-vaśago'ami na svatantraḥ prabhavati
samyamane mamāpi kṛṣṇaḥ ||"

Hence these chapters, though not recognising Kṛṣṇa as the Bhagavat himself, have a Bhāgavata tinge. On the other hand, chaps. 13-18 have a Pāñcarātra stamp, because in these chapters Nārāyaṇa and the eight-syllabled Mantra 'om namo nārāyaṇāya' are praised, and there is no mention of the name 'Kṛṣṇa'. That chap. 13 is a later addition is also shown by the absence of praise of Viṣṇu or Vaiṣṇavism in this chapter (dealing with Yama-Yamī-samvāda) except in the line 'cittam me nirmalam bhadre viṣṇau rudre oṣa samasthitam' (spoken by Yama to Yamī) which gives, unlike the other chapters, the same place to Viṣṇu and Rudra. As the interlocutors Śuka and Vyāsa of chaps. 13-18 are first introduced in chap. 7, these chapters are most probably later than chaps. 7-12.

From what has been said above regarding the addition and elimination of chapters and verses in the present *Narasimha-p.*, it is clear that this Purāṇa has been revised on more occasions than one. A comparison between the texts of the same extracts as quoted by different Smṛti-writers and occurring in the printed ed., also lends strong support in this direction.¹ The

¹ For instance, a comparison between *Nar.* 34, 6-12 and these very verses as quoted by Narasimha Vṛjapeyin in his *Nityācūṛa-pradīpa*, pp. 558-560, shows how single lines of the quoted passage have been expanded into verses in the printed ed. For example, the line 'toyena bhaktyā saṁanūpya viṣṇu-loke mahīyate' (in *Nityācūṛa-pradīpa*, p. 558) = the verse 'snūpya toyena payasā narasimhaḥ narādhipaḥ sarva-pāpa-vinirmukto viṣṇu-loke mahīyate' (*Nar.* 34, 6), the line 'snūpya dadhṇā sakṛd viṣṇuḥ viṣṇu-lokam avāpnuyāt' (in *Nityācūṛa-pradīpa*, p. 558) = the verse 'snūpya dadhṇā sakṛd yastu nirmalaḥ priya-darśanaḥ viṣṇu-lokam avāpnoti pūjyamānaḥ srottamāḥ' (*Nar.* 34, 7), and so on. Again, a comparison between the texts of the verses quoted from the *Narasimha-p.* in *Madana-pūrijñā*, pp. 301-2, *Smṛti-tattva* I, p. 411 and *Nityācūṛa-pradīpa*, p. 617 shows that the texts of the *Narasimha-p.*, used by Raghunandana and Narasimha Vṛjapeyin, agree more with that of the printed ed. than with the text used by Madanapāla.

verses and even large extracts, quoted by Hemādri from the 'Narasimha-p.' on different kinds of Vratas¹ and donations but not found in the present *Narasimha-p.*, show that the text of this Purāna as used by Hemādri was more extensive. Narasimha Vājaṇṇi explains the smaller bulk of the present *Narasimha-p.* saying, "As the number (of ślokaś) of the famous *Narasimha* is not found to be 18000, it seems that a portion has been lost in course of time."²

The mention of Tulasi in chaps. 31 (verse 87) and 34 (verses 19 and 23) and in the additional verses contained in the Dacca University Mss in their chapters corresponding to chap. 57 of the printed ed., should not be taken to go against the above date of the *Narasimha-p.* This mention is certainly due to later revisions of the Purāna, because, of the above-mentioned chapters containing the mention of Tulasi, chap. 31 (verses 1-97) has been found to be spurious; and *Nar.* 34, 19 does not occur in the Ms. π used in the printed ed. Moreover, in chap. 33, which deals with the results of various kinds of service rendered to Viṣṇu and of offering different articles to this deity, there is mention of 'bilva-patra' but not of Tulasi; nor is Tulasi mentioned in chaps 56 (on the method of consecration of the images of Viṣṇu), 62 (on the Vedic method of Viṣṇu-worship) and 63 (on the popular method of Viṣṇu-worship)

It is probably due to the repeated revisions of the present *Narasimha-p.* that there are disagreements between a number of statements made even in those chapters which cannot be taken as spurious. For instance, in *Nar.* 3, 8 Svāyambhuva Manu is said to have been the son of Dakṣa and his wife born respectively from Brahmā's right and left thumbs, but in *Nar.* 5, 22 Svāyambhuva Manu is said to have given his daughter Prasuti in marriage to Dakṣa; in *Nar.* 3, 3-5 Rudra is said to have been born of Brahmā's rage (rośa) but in *Nar.* 5, 4-5 it is said that when Brahmā was thinking of some worthy son at the beginning of the Brāhma Kalpa, the blue-red (nila-lohita) Rudra is said to have appeared on Brahmā's lap as a child with a body half male and half female; in *Nar.* 4, 2-4 Brahmā is said to have

¹ viz., Narasimha-caturdaśī-vrata, Hari-vrata, Pātra-vrata, etc

² *Nityācāra-pradīpa*, p. 18.

³ [Annals, B. O. R. J.]

created from his mind ten sons (viz, Marici, Atri, Angiras, Pulaha, Kratu, Pulastya, Pracetas, Bhṛgu, Nārada and Vasistha), of whom Nārada took to abstention (nivr̥tti-dharma), but in *Nar.* 5, 17-19 Brahmā is said to have created nine sons (Marici and others, except Nārada) who were known as 'nine Brahmās', and so on

Though the *Narasimha-p* proposes to give 'in brief (samkṣepāt) the genealogies of kings which were elaborately dealt with in the Purāṇas',¹ the defects, found in these genealogies, seem to be due as much to the carelessness of the people of later ages in maintaining the correctness of these dynastic lists in their respective Mss as to their attempt at abridgment. For instance, in chaps 22 and 27, the printed edition as well as the Dacca University Ms No 284A mentions Aja as the son of Dirghabāhu, but the Dacca University Ms No 2713, though following the printed ed in chap 27, gives the pedigree of Aja as 'dirghabāhor dilīpah dilīpad raghub raghor ajah' in chap 22, in chaps 22 and 27, the printed ed as well as the Dacca University Ms No 284A makes Māndhātṛ son of Asamhitāsva (v l Asamkhyātāsva in chap. 22 of the printed ed), but in chap 27 they give a popular verse in which Māndhātṛ is called Yauvanāsva (i e son of Yuvanāsva) the latter pedigree of Māndhātṛ is supported by the Dacca University Ms No 2713 which mentions Māndhātṛ as the son of Yuvanāsva in chap 22 (yuvanāsvān mandhātā), after *Nar.* 27, 1 the Mss used in the printed ed. have lost an extract² which is found in the Dacca University Mss Nos 2713 and 284A, and so on. There are, of course, a few cases in which the disagreements are either to be removed by referring to other better Mss or to be ascribed to the revisions to which the extant *Narasimha-p* was subjected. For instance, different pedigrees of Soma are given in chaps 23 and 28 of the printed edition as well as the Dacca University Mss

¹ *Nar.* 22, 2. Also see *Nar.* 23, 1.

² viz, 'tat-putro venas tasya pṛthus tasya pṛthāśvāh (Ms No 284A omits 'pṛthāśvāh') : pṛthāśvād asamhitāśvāh : te catvaro rājāno bhūri-tejasaḥ kramād rājanam kṛtvā (Ms No 281A reads 'labdhvā' for 'kṛtvā') dharmato harim ananta- (Ms No 281A inserts 'bhoga-' after 'ananta-') śayanaiḥ arādhya bhaktya (Ms No 281A omits 'bhaktya') kratubhis caśvā svarlokan gataḥ :'

in chap. 22 Saudāsa's son is called Śatrundama in the printed edition as well as in the Dacca University Ms No. 284A, and Śatrundana in the Dacca University Ms No 2713, but in chap. 27 he is called Satrasava in the printed edition, Satreśvara in the Dacca University Ms No 284A, and Satyaśrava in the Dacca University Ms No. 2713, and so on.

The disagreements in the names and pedigrees of some of the kings in chaps 22-23 (on the genealogies of the kings of the solar and lunar dynasties) on the one hand and chaps 27-29 (on vamsānucarita, i. e. the accounts of the kings of these dynasties) on the other, are not real but are due to the editor of this Purāṇa who has not used sufficient number of Mss for his edition. For instance, in chap 22 Prthāśva's son is Asamkhyātāśva in the Dacca University Mss, while in chap 27 he is called Asamhataśva in the printed ed as well as in the Dacca University Mss; in chap 22 Māndhātṛ's son is called Purukutsa in the printed ed. as well as in the Dacca University Mss Nos. 284A and 2713, but in chap 27 māndhātṛ's son is named Purukuśya in the printed ed., Kurupuccha in the Dacca University Ms. No 284A, and Purukutsa in the Dacca University Ms No 2713; in chap 27 Dirghabāhu's father is named Anarana in the printed ed and Anaranya in the Dacca University Mss as well as in the Ms 7 used in the printed ed. but in chap 27 he is called Anaranya in all these sources; in chap. 22 Padma's son is Anuparna in the printed ed and Rṭuparna in the Dacca University Mss, but in chap. 27 he is called Rṭuparna in all these sources, and so on.

Though the *Matsya-p.*,¹ the *Skand-p.*² and the *Revā-māhātmya*³ attach the '*Narasimha-p.*' to the *Padma-p.* as a

¹ upabhedān pravakṣyāmi loke ye saṃpratiśthitāḥ |
pādme purāṇe tatroktam narasimhopavarṇanam |
taccōṣṭādāśasāhasraṃ nārasimham ihocyate || *Matsya-p.* 53, 59.

This verse is quoted by Hemādri (in his *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi*, I, p. 533, and II, 1, p. 21), Narasimha Vajapeyī (in his *Nṛtyācāra-pradīpa*, p. 18), Jīva Gosvāmin (in his commentary, called *Kṛama-saṃdarbha*, on *Bhāgavata* XII, 7, 17-22) and Mitra Miśra (in his *Viramitrodaya*, Paribhāṣā-prakāśa, p. 14). Mitra Miśra does not quote the first line.

² VII, (Prabhāsa-kh.), 1, 2, 79b-80. This verse is the same as *Matsya-p.* 53, 59 quoted above.

³ See Aufrecht, *Bodleian Catalogue*, p. 65. The *Revā-māhātmya* claims to be a part of the *Vāyu-p.*

sub-division (upabheda) of the latter, the present *Narasimha-p.* always calls itself a 'Purāna'¹ and never an Upapurāna, nor does it attach itself to any Mahāpurāna for the sake of authority. As a matter of fact, in chap. 1, verses 33-34 it speaks of the five characteristics of 'Purāna', viz., sarga, pratisarga, vamsa, manvantara and vamsānucarita, and proposes to deal with all these topics, and in chap. 67, verses 17-18 it says that it has dealt with the five topics, viz., sarga, pratisarga etc., but it betrays no knowledge of the Upapurānas. So, it is evident that though according to later tradition the *Narasimha-p.* is classed as an Upapurāna, it is really an independent 'Purāna' like the *Vāyu*, *Viṣṇu* etc.

It has already been said that the present *Narasimha-p.* knows the extant *Vāyu* and *Viṣṇu* and the earlier *Purāṇa-p.* Its mention of the word 'Purāna' in the plural number on several occasions to mean distinct Purāṇic works, shows that more Purānas than one came into existence before its composition.² It is not known whether the *Mārkaṇḍeya-p.* or the *Viṣṇudharmottara* is referred to in chap. 10 (verses 54-55) which seems to be a later addition.

A careful examination of the original and the spurious chapters of the present *Narasimha-p.* shows that this Purāna was originally a work of the Pāñcarātra sect with remarkable Bhāgavata inclination. The Pāñcarātras themselves added a few more chapters and extracts at a later date. It was then considerably changed by the Bhāgavatas with further additions and alterations.

The entire *Narasimha-p.*, as we have it now, is not composed in verse. There are few chapters and extracts which are written in simple prose. These are the following — Nar. 19, 7-23 (on the birth of the Asvins), chap. 21 (on the origin of the Maruts); 22, 4-15 (on the names of the kings of the solar race); 23, 2-13 (on the names of the kings of the lunar race); 24, 1-36 (on the Manvantaras), 27, 1-12 (on the accounts of the kings of the

¹ See Nar. 1, 25, 1, 24, 1, 29, 67, 17, 67, 21, 22 and 25. See also the chapter-colophons. In the Mes also the *Narasimha-p.* is called a 'Purāṇa'.

² See Nar. 1, 24 (vyāsa-prasādāj janāni purāṇāni tapodhanāḥ), 22, 2 (rājyūṣā vamsāḥ purāṇeṣu vistareṇa prakīrtitah), 56, 10b-11a, 58, 108.

solar race); 28, 1-16 (on the accounts of the kings of the lunar race); 29, 1-12 (on the accounts of the kings of the lunar race); 30, 2-16 (except 5, which is a verse); 52, 25-31. A portion of chap. 9 is written in a peculiar metre with 25 syllables in each line.

The language of the *Narasimha-p.* contains numerous solecisms. For instance, it has 'abhūvan' for 'abhavan' (Nar 1, 62), 'vyajāyata' for 'vyajanayat' (Nar 5, 21), 'jajñe' for 'janayāmāsa' (Nar. 5, 29, 31 and 35), 'snāyanti' for 'snānti' (Nar. 6, 26), 'vedavidaiḥ' for 'vedavidbhiḥ' (6, 46), 'susamgita-vidaiḥ' for 'vidbhiḥ' (34, 36), 'mātr-pitarau' for 'mātā-pitarau' (7, 14), 'viksayāmāsa' for 'viksāmāsa' (14, 23), 'vartatim' for 'vartamānām' (19, 15), 'manujām' for 'manujānām' (18, 12), 'pravartatim' for 'pravartamānām' (19, 17), and so on.

Like the other Purāṇic works, the *Narasimha-p.* also tries to give itself a garb of great sanctity and high antiquity by tracing its descent from Brahmā. In chap. 67, verses 19-22 it gives the following tradition of inheritance:— Brahmā himself spoke out this Purāṇa to the sages Marīci and others; the next recipient was Mārkaṇḍeya, who then narrated it to a king of the Nāga family; ¹ Vyāsa then received it through Narasimha's favour.

Nar. 57 (verses 8 to the end) and 58-61, which deal with the duties of the four castes and orders of life, are found printed word for word under the title *Hārīta-saṃhitā* in the *Ānandīya Smṛti*.² These chapters also appear as *Laghu-hārīta-smṛti* in Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara's *Dharmaśāstra-saṅgraha* (Vol. I, pp. 172 ff.). Now, the question arises as to whether it was the *Hārīta-saṃhitā* (or *Laghu-hārīta-smṛti*) which was incorporated in the *Narasimha-p.*, or the above-mentioned chapters of the *Narasimha-p.* were given the character of an independent Smṛti work under the title '*Hārīta-saṃhitā*' (or *Laghu-hārīta-smṛti*). An examination of the *Hārīta-saṃhitā* shows that it was the

¹ For the reading 'rājño nāga-kulasya ha' of the printed ed., the Dacca University Mss Nos. 323 and 2713 read 'rājño vai nākulasya ha' and 'rājño vai nāhusasya ha' respectively.

² Edited (with a Bengali translation) by Pañcōṣana Tarkaratna and published by the Vangavāsī Press, Calcutta. Second edition, 1316 B S.

above-mentioned chapters of the present *Narasimha-p.* which were taken off and given the form of an independent work under the title 'Hārīta-saṁhitā' (or 'Laghu-hārīta-smṛti') which was derived from the name of the original speaker Hārīta. The *Hārīta-saṁhitā* begins as follows

ye varnāśrama-dharmasthās te bhaktāḥ keśavam prati ।
 iti pūrvam tvayā proktam bhūr bhuvah svar dvijottamāḥ ॥
 varnānām āśramānām ca dharmān no brūhi sattama ।
 yena samtusyate devo nārasimhaḥ sanātanaḥ ॥

mārkaṇḍeya uvāca ।

atrāham kathayisyāmi purā vṛttam anuttamam ।
 rsiḥ saha samvādam hārītasya mahātmanah ॥

Of these verses, which are the same as *Nar* 57, 8-10, the first shows that something has already been said, of which these verses form a continuation, and in fact the first verse points to *Nar* 57, 2-7 wherein Mārkaṇḍeya, being asked by king Sahasrāṇika, enumerates the characteristics of the devotees of Viṣṇu thus.

viṣṇu-bhaktā mahotsāhā viṣṇovarcana-vidhau sadā ।
 samyatā dharma-sampannāḥ sarvārthān sādhyanti te ॥
 paropakāra-niratā guru-śusrūṣaṇe ratāḥ ।
 varnāśramācārayutāḥ sarvesāṁ supriyamvadāḥ ॥

&c

&c

Though from a perusal of the *Hārīta-saṁhitā* we understand that Mārkaṇḍeya reports to a king named Sahasrāṇika what Hārīta said to the sages on the duties of the four castes and orders of life, nothing is said in the *Hārīta-saṁhitā* either about the identity of these two persons or about the occasion, time or place in which they met each other. Even the name of the king is given as late as in chap. 7 (verse 20). But it is the *Narasimha-p.* which tells us who king Sahasrāṇika was and how he met the sage Mārkaṇḍeya. We have already said that the *Narasimha-p.* is a work meant for the glorification of the worship of Narasimha. This character is betrayed by the *Hārīta-saṁhitā* also.¹ Moreover, none of the quotations made in their works by Viśvarūpa, Aparārka, Bhavadeva, Jimūtavāhana, Devanabhata and Anī-

¹ See its introductory verse quoted above, see also *Hārīta-saṁhitā* 2, 9, 4, 75-76a, 7, 19.

ruddha-bhāṭṭa from Hārīta, Vṛddha-hārīta, Laghu-hārīta, Brhaddhārīta and Svalpa-hārīta is to be met with in our so-called *Hārīta-saṃhitā*. On the other hand, some of the quotations made by Aparārka from the 'Narasimha-p' are traceable in the *Hārīta-saṃhitā*. For example,

the verses quoted from the *Hārīta-saṃhitā*
'Narasimha-p' in Aparārka's
commentary on the *Laghu-vaiṣṇava-smṛti*,

p 79	=	3, 12
p 125	=	4, 18-20.
p 153	=	4, 60-61,
p 189	=	4, 71, 72a, and 73a,
p 965	=	6, 11b-22.

These show that the chapters, now known as *Hārīta-saṃhitā* or *Laghu-hārīta-smṛti*, originally belonged to the *Narasimha-p*. These chapters seem to be based on different Smṛti works such as the *Parāśara-smṛti* and the *Hārīta-dharmaśāstra* (as known to Devanabhaṭṭa), because *Parāśara-smṛti* I, 50 (vaiśvadeve tu samprāpte etc.) greatly resembles *Nar.* 58, 100-101a (akṛte vaiśvadeve tu etc.), and the verses 'anena vidhinā yo hi āśramān upasevate etc.' quoted from the '*Hārīta-dharmaśāstra*' in *Smṛti-candrikā* I, p 174 slightly resembles *Nar.* 58, 37 (evam yo vidhim āsthāya etc.).

Here we should like to say a few words on the contents of the *Narasimha-p* as known to some of the Nibandha-writers. In his *Smṛti-tattva* I, p 351 Raghunandana quotes from the *Narasimha-p*. twenty-four metrical lines on general maxims (naya), such as 'One should give salutary advice to his friend in proper time, even though the latter does not ask for it' 'One should not begin any work which may create repentance in the end', 'One who believes the servants of the king or the bastards, do not live long', 'One should not allow the remaining part of the enemies, debt and fire to continue, because these increase again', and so on. He also quotes in *Smṛti-tattva* I, p 827 a verse on the proper time for marriage. In his *Smṛti-tattva* II, p 66 Raghunandana quotes from the same source a verse in which 'Tulasī' and 'Kṛṣṇa-tulasī' have been mentioned as pleasing to Hari. In his

Vidhāna-pūrvajāta I, p. 451 Anantabhatta quotes from the 'Narasimha' seventeen metrical lines on dressing a child with clothes for the first time. In his *Caluvarga-cintāmāni* II, ii, pp 41-49 Hemādri quotes a large extract of 173 metrical lines on a vow called Narasimha-caturdasi which was given in the 'Narasimha-p.' in connection with the Narasimha-prādurbhāva. In this extract Nrsimha, being asked by Prahlāda as to how he became devoted to Nrsimha and was blessed with good, says that in his previous birth Prahlāda was a Brahman named Vāsudeva and was addicted to a prostitute and that this Vāsudeva performed no other good deed than a Vrata of Nrsimha. Prahlāda again asked Nrsimha to narrate in details the whole story. Consequently Nrsimha said that in the city of Avantī there was a famous Brahman named Susarman who mastered all the Vedas and performed all his duties. This Susarman had a chaste and devoted wife named Susilā, who gave birth to five worthy sons, of whom Vāsudeva was the youngest. Unlike the other brothers, Vāsudeva was addicted to prostitutes, became a drunkard and stole gold for financing his evil deeds. Once he quarrelled with that prostitute and kept awake throughout the whole night without taking food. The prostitute also did so. Thus Vāsudeva unconsciously performed the Vrata of Nrsimha, was born as Prahlāda, and became devoted to Nrsimha. The prostitute became an Apsaras. Next, being asked by Prahlāda to describe the Vrata in details, Nrsimha did so. Hemādri also quotes verses on Hari-vrata, Patra-vrata, and offer of different articles such as Kainandalu, fruits, foot-wear, umbrella, clothes etc. to the Pitis in Śrāddha ceremonies. Sulapani also quotes verses on Śrāddha in his *Vrata-kālī-mṛka*, *Śrāddha-mṛka* and *Tithi-mṛka*. It is needless to say that none of these verses is found in the present *Narasimha-p*.

APPENDIX I

Edited by Uddhavācārya and published by Gopal Narayan & Co., Bombay. Second edition, Bombay 1911.

This is a very careless edition based on three Mss which have been referred to simply as क, ख and ग, but of which no information or description has been given by the editor.

In this edition, the chapter immediately following chap 10 is called eleventh at the beginning but twelfth at the end. As a matter of fact, chaps 11 and 12 have been combined without any demarcation, though Ms. A says that chap 12 begins from verse 54.

Though I am fully conscious of the fact that no serious chronological deduction should be based on this worthless edition, the absence of any better, or even a second, edition of this Purāṇa has compelled me to utilise it here. I have however, consulted the three Mss preserved in the Dacca University Library and have not used any evidence which is not supported at least by these Mss.

For Mes of this Purāna see.

(1) R. L. Mitra, *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.* iii, pp 1-5, No. 1020.

[This Ms which consists of 63 chapters and was found at Navadvipa is written in Bengali characters and dated Saka 1567 It begins as follows -

om namo prsimbāva ।

tapta-hātaka-keśāgra-īvalat-pāvaka-locana ।

vajrādhika-pakṣa-sparśa divya-simha namo'stu te ||

nakha-mukha-vilikhita-diti-tanayorah-paripatad-asrg-
arunīkṛta-gātrah ।

himakara-giririva garika-gātro naraharir abarabar
avatu sa hy asmān ||

himavad-vāsīṇaḥ sarve munayo veda-pāragah ।

tri-kāla-jñā mahātmāno naimiśāranya-vāsinaḥ ||

&c.

&c

and end-thus.

netrair mātanda-candaś tribhir anala-śikhā nyagvahadbhiḥ
pradīptāḥ

pāyād vo nārasimbah kara-khara-nakharair bhinnā-daityas

ciradyah ।

kim kim simhas tatah kim nara-sadrśa-vapur deva oitram grhītā

naivam dbik konvajīved drutam upanayatām so' pi satyam

haiśāh ।

cāpam cāpam nakhāngam jhatitī dahu dahu karkāśatvaim

nakhānām

ity evam daitya-nātham nija-nakha-kulīśair jaghnivān yāh

śarośī ॥

iti śrīnārasimbapurāṇe ādye d'harinārtha kama-mok a-pradāyini

para-brahma-svapūṇa idam ekam sunispannam dhyeyo

nārāyaṇaḥ sadā nārāyaṇadevat param aṣṭi kimeit ।

śrīnārasimbapurāṇam samāptam ॥ 63 ॥

The list of its contents, as given by Mitra, show, that it lacks the story of Dhruva as occurring in chap 31, verses 1-97 of the printed edition, the story of Prahlāda as given in chaps 40 (verses 60b-61b), 41-43 and 44 (verses 1-13) of the printed edition, the description of the characteristic evils of the Kali age as given in chap 54, verses 8-61 of the printed edition as well as the chaps 64 (on the interlocution of Nārada and Pundarīka on the glories of Nārāyaṇa) and 68 (on the glorification of the *Narasimha-p*) of the printed edition.

It also seems to lack the story of the Pāṇḍavas killing of the demons Bahuroman and Shūlamāsa on the bank of the Revā for carrying away Draupadī by force (as given in chap 33, verses 15-85 and chap 34, verse 1 of the printed ed), and the story of India's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra 'om namo nārāyaṇaya' (as found in chap. 63, verses 10-119a of the printed ed)

It inserts a chapter on praise of holy places (tīrthaprasāṁsā) in Ayodhyā immediately after the chapters on Rāma-pradur bhāva]

(2) Aufrecht, *Indo-European Catalogue* pp 82-83, No. 138-139

[(1) Ms. No 138, which consists of 62 chapters and is written in Devanāgarī script, begins as follows -

nārāyaṇam namaskṛtya etc

tapta-hātaka-keśānta jvalat-pāvaka-locana(h) ।

vajrādḥika-nakha-sparśa divya simha nāmo'stu te ॥

pātu vo narasimhasya nakha-lāṅgala-kotayah |
 hiranya-kaśipo vrakṣa aṣṭkaddamamāruṇāḥ ||
 homavaddhāgnināḥ sarve munayo veda-pāragāḥ |
 tri-kāla-jñā mahātmāno naimisāraṇya-vāsinaḥ ||

c

&c.

but its c and final colophon are not given by Aufrecht

Aufrecht's description of its contents shows that it not only lacks, like Mitra's Ms, the stories of Dhruva and Prahlāda and the description of the characteristics of the Kali age, but also the topics on Yoga (as found in chap. 61 of the printed ed), and the enumeration of Tīrthas (as found in chaps. 65-67 of the printed ed)

It also seems to lack the story of the killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlāsiras by the Pāṇḍavas, and the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra

The story of Rāma-prādurbhāva is given in this Ms in five chapters as against six (viz , 47-52) of the printed ed. (See also Dacca University Ms No 2713, described below, which also gives in five chapters the contents of chaps. 47-52 of the printed ed.)

It does not insert any chapter on praise of holy places in Ayodhyā.

(ii) Ms No 139, which is written in Devanāgarī, is generally the same as the above Ms, but contains chaps 65-67 (on Tīrthas) of the printed ed]

(3) Eggeling, *India Office Catalogue*, VI, pp 1211-14, Nos 3375-79

[(1) Of these five Mss, the first (Cat No 3375), which was copied in Devanāgarī scripts in 1798 A.D., consists of 67 chapters. It begins with the verses ' tapta-hātaka-keśāgra ' and ' nakha-mukha-vidālita (v. l vilikhita) -diti-tanayorah ' (with slight variations in readings) and ends thus -

nr̥simhāsya-mahādeva-pūjite bhakta-vatsale |
 loka-nāthe prabhau tena trilokya-pūjito bhavet ||
 yo narasimha-vapur āsthitah pura
 hitāya lokasya dīteḥ sutam yudhi |

nakhaib sutikṣṇair vidadāra vairinam
 divaukaśām tam pranamāmi keśavam ||

iti sr̥ṅsr̥simhapurāṇe ādye dharmārtha-kāma-mokṣa-pradāyini
 nāma sattīrtha-varṇano nāmādhyāyah ||

It lacks chaps. 64 and 68 of the printed ed.

As Eggeling does not give the contents of the chapters, we do not know definitely whether this Ms also lacks the stories of Dhruva and Prahlāda, the story of the Pāṇḍavas' killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthūlasiras, the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra, and the description of the evils of the Kali age. It is also not known whether it inserts a chapter on holy places in Ayodhyā.

(ii) The next two Mss (Cat Nos 3376-77), which also are written in Devanāgarī and of which the second one lacks the first Adhyāya, are practically the same as the preceding Ms. Their concluding verses are (with some variations in readings) the same as those of the Ms noticed by Mitra, and their colophon is as follows -

iti śrīnārasimhapurāṇe ādye dharmārtha-kāma-moksa-pradāyini para-brahma-svarupini idam ekam saṃpannam dhyeyo nārāyaṇaḥ sadā : na vasudevāt param asti kimcit || iti nārasimhapurāṇam samāptam ||

(iii) The fourth Ms (Cat No 3378) is written in Devanāgarī by different hands. It was copied in about 1500-1600 A. D., its last five folios being supplied in 1789 A. D. It begins with the verse 'nakha-mukha-vilakṣita-diti-tanayorah'. In the modern portion of this Ms the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra (as found in chap 63, verses 10-11a of the printed ed.) and the interlocution between Nārada and Puṇḍrika on the glories of Nārāyaṇa (as occurring in chap 61 of the printed ed.) are given.

(iv) The fifth Ms (Cat No 3379 on Rāma-prādurbhāva) is written in Devanāgarī and divided into six sections named after the six Kāṇḍas (ending with the Lankā-kāṇḍa) of the Rāmāyaṇa. It is practically the same as chaps 47-52 of the printed ed.]

(4) Hrishikesh Shastri and Shivachandra Gui, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss in the Library of the Calcutta Sanskrit College* (hereinafter referred to as *Cal Sans Coll Cat*), IV, pp. 29-30 (Ms. No 36) and pp 184-5 (Ms No 298)

[(1) Ms. No. 36 consists of 63 chapters and is written in Bengali characters. It is described by Shastri and Gui as 'not old.' It begins with the verses 'tapta-hūṭaka-keśāgra' and 'nakha-mukha-vilasita-dititanayorah,' and ends thus

prasanne deva-deveṣu sarva-pāpaksayo bhavet :

paksinah pāpa-baddhās te muktim yānti parāṃ gatim ॥

nakhaiḥ sutikṣṇair vvidadāra vairinam

divaukasām tam pranamāmi keśavam ॥

vyāśrg-bhūd-bhinna-bhāsvat-prthu-lalita-laṭācchādita

kintvamārgah ।

pātālam prāpta-pādaḥ prakharatara-nakha-śrotaso

nārasimhah ॥

kara-khara-nakharaiḥ bhinna-vrtyās cīram vah ॥

kim kim siddhas tat kinvah sadisa-vapumetava citram gihito

nevādhikah so' pi jivendratamapanayatām so'pi nītvam

harīśah ।

cāpamaśaraganairdaśaijaghuivān yah sa rosate ॥

iti śrīnarasimhapurāṇe triṣastitamo' dhyāyah samāptam codam

narasimhapurāṇam ॥

This Ms lacks at least chap. 61 of the printed ed.

In spite of its numerous mistakes it seems to resemble much the Ms described by Mitra as well as Dacca University Ms No 2713 described below

(ii) Ms No. 298 is a 'very old' one written in Bengali script. It consists of 67 chapters. It begins with the verse tapta-bāta-keśagra' and ends with the chapter dealing with the 68 holy places sacred to Viṣṇu (vaiṣṇavāstasasti = chap. 65 of printed ed.) It lacks at least chaps. 66-68 of the printed ed.

As the contents of the different chapters of these two Mss are not given in the Catalogue, it is not possible to say which more chapters of the printed edition are wanting in these two Mss]

(5) Haraprasad Shastri, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss in the Collections of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (hereinafter referred to simply as *ASB Cat*), V, pp 711-13, Nos 4076-81

[(i) No 4076 It is written in Bengali script and dated Śaka 1617. It consists of 64 chapters, of which the 63rd chapter is named 'Tirtha-yātrā-prasāṃśā' (=chap 66 of the printed ed.). The Catalogue gives us no information regarding the contents of the different chapters

(ii) No 4076A It is written in Bengali characters and dated Saka 1586. No information regarding the number of its chapters or their contents is given by Shastri. '

(iii) Nos. 4077-81. Of these five Mss the first is written in Kashmiri and dated Samvat 1898, the second is written in

Nāgara of the 18th century, and the remaining three are written in Bengali scripts. Of these remaining three Mss the first is dated Śaka 1623 and the third is dated Śaka 1639

The numbers of chapters of these five Mss or their contents are not mentioned in the Catalogue]

(6) A B Keith, *Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prakrit Mss in the Library of the India Office*, Vol II, Part 1, p 916 (Nos. 6616-18)

[(1) No 6616 It is written in Grantha characters of about 1866-67 A. D. and consists of 61 chapters. Its beginning is very defective, and it ends with the verse 'yo nārasimham vapur āsthitah purā' Its colophon runs as follows— ita srīnārasimha-purāṇe ekasastitamo' dhyāyah । sri-lakṣma-nārasimhāṇṇam astu ॥ harih om । kara-kṛtva aparādham kṣantum arhanti santah.

(11) No 6617 — It is an incomplete Ms written in Bengali characters of about 1800 A. D. It begins with the same verses as those of Eggeling No 3375

(111) No 6618 — It deals only with geography and is not divided into chapters. It corresponds to chaps 30 and 31 (verses 98-112) of the printed ed. and lacks the story of Dhruva as found in chap 31, verses 1-97 of the printed ed.

(7) Dacca University Mss Nos 2713, 323, and 284A

[(i) Ms No 2713, which was collected from Vaidyavāṭi in the district of Hoogly, is written in Bengali characters and consists of 98 folios, of which fol 1 is damaged and fol 2 is mutilated at the left side. It contains 63 chapters and is dated Śaka 1567. It is fairly correct. Like *Mitra's* Ms., it begins with the verses 'tapta-hātaka-keśāgin' and 'nakha-mukha-vilikhita-dṛtanayorah', and ends thus

prasaṇne deva-devese sarva-pāpa-kṣayo bhavet ।
 prakṛta-pāpa-bandhas te muktun yānti parām punah ॥
 yo nārasimham vapur āsthitah purā
 hitāva lokasya dīṭh satam yudhi ।
 nakhaṇṇ sutikṣṇair vidadāra varitām
 divaukṣāṁ tam pranamāmi keśavam ॥
 vv ājrmṇhad-bhinna-bhāsvat-pīthu-lalita-śatācehā-
 ditārkendu-mārgah
 pātāla-prāpta-pāda-prakhara-nakha-prota-śeśāhi-bhogah ।
 netrair mātanda-candaśis tribhir anala-sikhām
 udvabadbhij pradīptah

pāyād vo nārasimbah kara-khara-nakharair bhinna-
 daityaś cīradyah ||
 kim kim sumbas tatah kim nara-sadrśa-vapur deva
 citram grhīto
 naivam dhik ko nu jīvet drutam upanayatām sopt
 satyam hailah ||
 cāpam cāpam na khadgam jhatitī daha daha karṇa-
 satvam rakṣaṇam
 itrevam daitya nātham nija-nakha-kulisan jaghnivān
 yah sarasā tu

Iti śrīnārasimhapurāṇe adye dharmatitha kāmā-mokṣa-pradā-
 yini parāmbrahma-svarūpini idam ekam suniṣṭṭamam dhiveyo
 nārāyaṇaḥ sadā i na va-udevāt puram asti kiṃcit śrīnārasimha
 purāṇam samāptam | śrīkṛṣṇa-cakravartinah pustakam idam |
 śrīgopāla-sarmanah svāksaram idam | subhāni astu śākābdah
 1567 || terikha 23 jaiśtṛah || astamya sukṛtāpāke tu guru-vāre
 samāptas cāyam grāṇṭhah ||

The corresponding chapters in this Ms and the printed ed
 are the following —

<i>Ms</i>	<i>Printed ed</i>	<i>Ms</i>	<i>Printed ed</i>
Chaps 1-29 =	Chap 1-29 respectively	Chap 48 =	Chap. 54 (ver- ses 1-6)
Chap. 30 =	Chaps 30 and 31 (verses 98- 113)	Chap 49 =	Chap 54, verse 7, Chap 55
Chap 31 =	Chap 32	Chap 50 =	Chap. 56
Chap. 32 =	Chap 33 (ver- ses 1-14), Chap 34 (ver- ses 2-55)	Chap 51 (except about 25 additional verses on selection of flowers and leaves for Viṣṇu worship)	= Chap 57 (ver- ses 1-7)
Chaps 33-37 =	Chaps 35-39 respectively	Chap 52 =	Chap 57 (ver- ses 8-30)
Chap 38 =	Chap 40 (except verses 60b-61b), Chap 44 (ver- ses 14-43).	Chap. 53 =	Chap 58 (ver- ses 1-16).
Chaps 39-44 =	Chaps 45-50 respectively	Chap. 54 =	Chap. 58 (ver- ses 17-38)
Chap 45 =	Chaps 51-52	Chap. 55 =	Chap 58 (ver- ses 33-115)
Chap. 46 (on holy places in Ayodhyā)	= x	Chaps 56-59 =	Chaps 59-62 respectively
Chap. 47 =	Chap. 53.	Chap. 60 =	Chap 63 (verses 1-9 and 119b- 122).
		Chaps. 61-63 =	Chaps 65-67 respectively.

The above table shows that this Ms lacks the following sections of the printed ed. —

Chap 31, verses 1-97	—	on the story of Dhruva ,
chap 33, verses 15-85 ,	} ---	on the story of the killing of the demons Bahuroman and Sthū-lasīras by the Pāṇḍavas .
chap 34, verse 1		
chap 40, verses 60b-61b	} —	on the story of Prahlāda .
chaps 41-43 .		
chap 41, verses 1-13		
chap 54, verses 8-61	—	on the characteristic evils of the Kali age ,
chap 63, verses 10-119a	—	on the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form by muttering the eight-syllabled Mantra ,
chap 64	—	dealing with the interlocution between Nārada and Pundarika on the glories of Nārāyaṇa ;
chap 68 ..	—	on the glorification of the <i>Nara-simha-p</i>

On the other hand, the printed edition lacks chap 46 (on holy places in Ayodhyā) and about 25 verses (on the selection of leaves and flowers for Viṣṇu-worship) of chap 51 of the Ms

This Ms deals with the story of Rāma-prādurbhāva in five chapters (viz , 41-45) as against six (viz , 47-52) of the printed ed , chap 45 of the former consisting of chaps 51-52 of the latter

The agreement between this Ms and that described by Mitra is very close, and as both these Mss were copied in Śaka 1567, they are either based on the same original or derived from the same archetype

(ii) Ms No. 323, which was procured from Ulā in the district of Nadia, is written in Bengali characters and consists of 131 folios, of which fols. 37-40 (containing chaps 19-27, and verses 1-16 of chap 28 of the printed ed) are missing and fol 131 is wrongly numbered 139 It contains 64 chapters and is dated Saka 1588

It begins and ends with the same verses (though with occasional variations in readings) as the preceding Ms, and its final colophon (viz , iti śrī-narasimha-purāṇe ādye dharmārtha-mokṣa-

pradāyini parambrahma-svarūpiṇi idam ekam suniṣpaṇnam
dhyeyo nārāyaṇaḥ sadā ! na vāsudevāt param asti kiṃcīt nāra-
siṃha-purāṇam samāptam ! subham astu sakāśādāḥ 1588 ! haraye
namaḥ govindāya namaḥ !) also agrees very closely with that
of the latter. (It should be mentioned here that the colophon of
its final chapter, which is almost the same as its final colophon,
runs thus.— iti śrī-nārasiṃha-purāṇe adye na
vāsudevāt param asti kiṃcīt prathamo' dhyāyah !).

This Ms lacks the same sections of the printed ed as the pre-
ceding Ms. It also contains, like the preceding Ms, a chapter
(viz., chap. 47 on holy places in Ayodhyā) and about 50 lines
(on the selection of leaves and flowers for Viṣṇu-worship) in
chap. 52, which do not occur in the printed ed.

Thus this Ms seems to have been derived from the same
archetype as the preceding Ms. The difference in the number of
chapters in these two Mss is due to the fact that the story of
Rama-prādurbhāva is given in the preceding Ms in five chapters
as against six (viz., chap. 41-46) of the present one.

(11) Ms No. 284A, which was procured from Nalāhāti in
the district of Burdwan, consists of 131 folios and is written in
Bengali script. It is dated Saka 1742 and contains 53 chapters,
of which chap. 44-53 are not numbered.

It begins with the verses ' nārāyaṇam namaskṛtya ', ' taptā-
hātaka-keśāgra ' and ' nakha-mukha-vilikhita-diti-tanayorah ' '
and ends thus —

imam stavam yah pathate sa mānavaḥ prāpnoti viṣṇor amitāt-
makam hi tat || iti śrī-narasimha-purāṇe dharmārtha-kāma-
mokṣa-pradāyini param-brahma-svarūpiṇi vaiṣṇavāsta-saṣṭi-
nāmādhyāyah ||

asya śrī-rājasimhasya prakṛtyālingito hariḥ !

rādhā-mohana-rayasya prīto bhavatu sarvadā ||

yugma-śruty-asva-candrāṅkita-śakamite bhāṣakare taisa yāte
natvālekhiṇi murāreḥ kajanu-yuga-samam pāda-yugmam
surāroyam !

śrī-rādhā-mohanākhyā-ksitipa-naraharer nārasiṃham purāṇam
gotrādevāṇvavāyaprabhavaḥ kṛtamahāyatnasantāna āṣu ||

In this Ms. chap 53 consists of chaps 57 (verses 8-20) and 65 of the printed edition. In verses 1-16 of chap. 53 of this Ms (which correspond to verses 8-20 of chap 57 of the printed ed.) king Sahasrāṅka asks Mārkaṇḍeya to describe to him the duties of the four castes and orders of life (varnāśrama-dharma). Consequently, Mārkaṇḍeya begins to report what Hārīta, being requested by some sages to speak on 'Varnāśrama-dharma', 'Yoga-sāstra' and 'Viṣṇu-tattva' (cf bhagavan sarvva-dharmamājña sarvva-dharmma-pravartaka | varnānām āśramānam ca dharmmān prabruhi āśvatāt | samasād yoga-sāstram tu yam dhyātva mucyate narah | viṣṇu-tattvam muni-sreṣṭha tvam hi naḥ paramo guruḥ !), said to them on these topics. But in these verses Hārīta is found only to introduce his subject by briefly narrating the origin of the four castes and the place fit for their residence and to say nothing on Varnāśrama-dharma etc. On the other hand, in verses 17ff. of this chapter (which corresponds to chap 65 of the printed ed.) Sūta, being requested by Bharaḍvāja, names the 68 places sacred to Viṣṇu. Hence it is sure that in the original Ms from which our present one was copied, verses 1-16 of chap 53 were followed by chapters on Varnāśrama-dharma, Yoga and Viṣṇu-tattva, i.e. by chaps 57 (verses 21-30-on the duties of Brāhmanas), 58-60 (on the duties of the Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Sūdras, as well as of the students, householders, forest-hermits and Yatis), 61 (on Yoga), 62 (on the Vedic procedure of Viṣṇu-worship) and 63 (verses 1-9 and 119b-122-on the popular method of Viṣṇu-worship) of the printed ed. It is most probably due to the inadvertence of the scribe that these intervening chapters and verses have been omitted in our present Ms.

As, like the other two Mss, it lacks the following sections of the printed ed., viz.,

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| chap. 31, verses 1-97 | —on the story of Dhruva, |
| chap 33, verses 15-85 | —on the story of the Pāṇḍavas' killing of the demons Bahuro-man and Sthūlasiraś. |
| chap. 40, verses 60b-61b, | } —on the story of Prahlāda, |
| chaps. 41-43, | |
| chap. 44, verses 1-13 | |
| chap. 54, verses 8-61 | —on the characteristic evils of the Kali age, |

we may assume that the story of Indra's getting rid of his female form (as found in chap 63, verses 10-119a of the printed ed) and the interlooution between Nārada and Pundarika on the glories of Nārāyana (as given in chap 64 of the printed ed.) were wanting in the original Ms from which our present one was copied.

(It should be mentioned here that the corresponding chapters of the Dacca University Mss on the one hand and the printed ed on the other, differ not only in readings but also occasionally in the numbers of verses. For instance, after verse 31 of chap. 5 the Dacca University Mss have 12 verses which are not found in the printed ed.)].

(8) R. L. Mitra, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner*, pp 207-8, No. 452.

This Ms is written in Nāgara and consists of only 41 chapters (so far as their number, given by Mitra in connection with the description of their contents, shows). The corresponding chapters of this Ms and the printed ed. are the following :-

<i>Ms</i>		<i>Printed ed.</i>	<i>Ms</i>		<i>Printed ed</i>
Chaps 1-29	=	Chaps. 1-29 respectively.	Chap. 32	=	Chaps. 33 (verses 1-14); 34
Chap. 30	=	Chaps. 30, 31 (verses 98-113)	Chap. 33	=	Chap. 35 (verses 2-55).
Chap. 31	=	Chap. 32.	Chaps. 34-41	=	Chaps. 36-39, 40 (except verses 60b-61b); 44 (verses 14-43); 45-47

So this Ms, which ends after dealing with only a few of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu, is necessarily incomplete. It lacks the stories of Dhruva, Prahlāda, and the Pāṇḍavas who killed the demons Baburoman and Sthūlaśiras for carrying away Draupadī by force.]

(9) P. P. S. Sastri, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tanjore Mahārāja Serfojī's Saravati Mahāl Library*, Tanjore, Vol. XV, pp. 7151-53, Nos. 10548-53.

[Of these Mss, the first (No. 10548) consists of 64 chapters and is written in Devanāgarī. It begins with the verse 'taptahāṭaka-keśāntarjvalat°' and ends with the verse 'yo nārasimham vapur āsthitaḥ purā' Its colophon is as follows - iti śrīmannārasimha-purāṇe ādye dharmārtha-kāma-mokṣa-pradāyini para-brahma-svarūpa-nirūpane catuṣṣastitamo' dhyāyah. The contents of its different chapters are not given in the Catalogue]

No information regarding the beginnings, ends and contents of the other Mss is given by Sastri]

(10) Chintaharan Chakravarti, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Vāṅmāyā Sāhitya Paṭiśāḍ*, Calcutta, p 72, No. 1432

[It contains chaps. 1-60 and is complete]

(11) Stein, *Jammu Catalogue*, p 202

[One of these two Mss is complete and is written in modern Kāśmīrī scripts, while the other deals with Lakṣmī-nṛsimha-sahasra-nāma.]

(12) *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Sanskrit College Library, Benares*, pp 337 and 338.

(13) Haralal, *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the Central Provinces and Berar*, pp 224 and 248.

(14) Lewis Rice, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Mysore and Coorg*, p 72

(15) Burnell, *Classified Index to the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Palace at Tanjore*, p 188

(16) Haraprasad Shastri, *Catalogue of Palm leaf and Selected Paper Manuscripts in the Durbar Library, Nepal*, p 49

[This Ms is written in Maithilī scripts]

APPENDIX II

(A)

The Dacca University Mss have the following verses after verse 31 of chap. 5 of the printed edition —

prityām pulastya-bhāryāyām dattolī tat-suto'bhavat |
 tasya vai viśravah putras tat-putro rāvanādavah ||
 rāksasā bahavah proktā lankāpura-nivāsinaḥ |
 yeśām vachāya lokeśo viśnuḥ kśīrodadhau purā |
 brahmādyaiḥ prārthito devair avatāram ihākarot ||
 karddamaś cāmbarīśaś ca sahisnuś ca suta-trayam |
 kṣamā tu susuve bhāryā pulahasya prajāpateḥ ||
 krato tu sannatir bhāryā vālakhilyān asūyata |
 sasti tāni sahasrāni rśinām ūrdhva-retasām |
 aṅgustha-parva-mātrānām jvalad-bhāskara-tejasām ||
 pracetaso'tha satyāyām satyasandhādayah sūtāḥ |
 jātās tat-putra-putrās ca śataśo'tha sahasrasaḥ ||
 ūrjāyām ca vaśīsthasya saptājāyanta vai sūtāḥ |
 rajogātrordhvabāhuś ca sabalaś cānaghaś tathā ||
 sutapāḥ śukra ity ete sarve saptarśayo'bhavan ||
 bhṛgoḥ khyātyām samutpannā lakṣmī viśnu-parigrahaḥ |
 tathā dhātṛ-vidhātārau khyātyām jātau sūtau bhṛgoḥ ||
 āyatir niyatīś caiva meruḥ kanye suśobhane |
 dhātur vidhātus ca te bhārye tayor jātau sūtāv ubhau ||
 prānaś caiva mrkandus ca mārkaṇḍeyo mrkaṇḍutah |
 yena mṛtyur jito vipra purā nārāyaṇāśrayāt |
 tato vedasirā jāñe prānaśyāpi suto'bhavat |
 dyutimān iti vikhyātaḥ sañjayaś tat-suto'bhavat ||
 tato vameś mahābhāga bhārgavo viśtaram galah ||

See Mss No 284A (fol 8b-9b), 323 (fol. 9b-10a), and 2713 (fol. 7a-b).

Of the variations in readings in these Mss, the following are more important —

Ms No. 2713 reads 'kapardha' for 'karddhama°' in line 6.

Ms No. 323 reads 'sumatī' for 'sannatī°' in line 8.

Ms No 284A reads 'sandhyāyām' for 'satyāyām' in line 11;

Mss No. 323 and 2713 read 'satyasandhās trayah' for 'satya-sandhādayah' in line 11;

Ms No. 284A reads 'savara°' for 'sabala°' in line 14.

(B)

After verse 7 of chap 57 of the printed edition, the Dacca University Mss have the following verses —

puspā aranya-sambhūtaish patrair vā giri-sambhavaish |
 aparyusita-nīśchidraish proksitair jantu-varjitaiḥ ||
 ātmārāmodbhavaish vāpi puspaiḥ sampūjayeddharim |
 puspa-jāti-vīśesais tu bhavet punyam vīśesataḥ ||
 tapah-śīla-guṇopete pātre vedasya pārage |
 daśa datvā suvarṇāni yat phalam labhate narah |
 tat phalam labhate martyo harau kusuma-dānataḥ ||
 drona-puspa-tatṭhaikasmīn mādhanvāya nivedite |
 daśa datvā suvarṇāni yat phalam tadavāpnuyāt ||
 evam puspa-vīśesena phalam tadadhikam nrpa |
 jñeyam puspāntareṇaiva yathā svāt tan nibodha me ||
 drona-puspa-sahasrebhyaḥ khādīram samvīśisyate |
 khādīrebhyaḥ sahasrebhyaḥ śānti-puspam vīśisyate ||
 śānti-puspa-sahasrebhyo bilva-puspam vīśisyate |
 bilva-puspa-sahasrebhyo vaka-puspam vīśisyate ||
 vaka-puspa-sahasrāddhi nandyaśvartam vīśisyate |
 nandyaśvartā sahasrebhyaḥ karavīram vīśisyate ||
 karavīra-sahasrebhyaḥ śvetam tat puspam uttamam |
 karavīra-śveta-puspāt palāśam puspam uttamam ||
 palāśa-puspa-sahasrāddhi kuśa-puspam vīśisyate |
 kuśa-puspa-sahasrāddhi vana-mālā vīśisyate ||
 vana-mālā sahasrāddhi campakam puspam vīśiyate |
 campakānām puspa-śatād asokam puspam uttamam ||
 asokānām sahasrāddhi samantī-puspam uttamam |
 samantī-puspa-sahasrāddhi kubja-puspam vīśisyate |
 kubja-puspa-sahasrāt tu mālātī-puspam uttamam |
 mālātī-puspa-sahasrāddhi sandhyāraktam taduttamam ||
 sandhyārakta-sahasrāddhi tri-sandhya-śvetam uttamam ||
 tri-sandhyā-śveta-sahasrāt kunda-puspam vīśisyate ||
 kunda-puspa sahasrāddhi śata-patram vīśisyate |
 śatapatra-sahasrāddhi mallikā-puspam uttamam ||
 mallikā-puspa-sahasrāj jāti-puspam vīśisyate |
 sarvasām puspa-jātinām jāti-puspāni cottamam |
 jāti-puspa-sahasreṇa yo mālām nityaśo dadet |
 viśnave vidhivad bhaktyā tasya punya-phalam śrnu ||

kalpa-koti-sahasrāṇi kalpa-koti-satāṇi ca ।
 vased viṣṇu-pure śrīmān viṣṇu-tūlya-parakramah ॥
 sesānām puṣpa-jātinām yat phalam vidhi-coditam ।
 tat-phalasyānusāren ॥ viṣṇu-loke mahivāte ॥
 prāṇy api supuṣpāni hareḥ ॥ prīti-karāṇi ca ।
 pravakṣyāmi nṛpa-sreṣṭha śṛṇusva gadato mātā ॥
 apāmārga-putram prathamam tasmād bhrngārakam param ।
 tasmāt tu khādīram sreṣṭham tasmāt tu saṁi-patrakam ॥
 durvā-patram tataḥ sreṣṭham tato'pi kusa-patrakam ।
 tasmād āmalakam śreṣṭham tato bilvasya patrakam ॥
 bilva-patrād api hareḥ tulasī-patram uttamam ॥
 etesām tu yathā-labdhaiḥ ॥ patrair vā yo'reyēddharim ।
 saiva-pāpa vimuktō viṣṇu-loke mahivāte ॥
 evam hi rājan narasiṁha-murteḥ pūyāni puṣpāni tavetarāṇi ।
 etaiḥ ca nityam harim arcya bhaktyā nare viśuddho harim
 eva yāti ॥

See Mss Nos 284A (fol. 118a 119a), 323 (fol. 114a-115a),
 and 2713 (fol. 86b-87b)

The important differences in readings in these Mss are the following —

Ms No. 284A omits 'saṁi-puṣpam viśisyate ॥ saṁi-puṣpa-sahasrebhyaḥ' in lines 13-14

Ms No 323 omits line 18 (karavīra-sahasrebhyaḥ etc.).

Ms No 323 omits 'vanamālā viśisyate ॥ vanamālā-sahasrā-ddhi' in lines 21-22 ;

for 'samantī' in lines 24 and 25, Ms 284A (after marginal correction) reads 'sevanti', and Ms No. 323 reads 'semanti'.

Ms No. 2713 omits lines 33 (sarvāsām puṣpa-jātinām etc.)

Ms No. 2713 reads 'damanakam' for 'āmalakam' in line 45.

APPENDIX III

Verses quoted from the ' *Narasimha-p* ' or ' *Nrasimha-p* . '

or ' *Nārasimha* ' in

1 Aparārka's	<i>Narasimha-p</i>	<i>Narasimha-p</i>
com on the	p 965	= 60, 12-15,
<i>Yājñavalkya-smṛti</i> ,		17 ^a -e, 16 and
		17 ⁱ -h
p 79	= 58, 34 ^b -35 ^a	The verses ' udghāṭayec
p 125	= 58, 58 ^b -59	ca kavacam and ' catu-
	Three lines from ' sam-	rangulai ^b prakāśya '
	dhyakarmāvasāne tu '	and the line ' yatī-
	are not found in the	dharmaṛata ^b ', which
	<i>Narasimha-p</i>	are not found in the
p 131	= 58, 88 ^b -89	printed ed. occur in
	The verse ' dadyat sarva	chap 57 of the Dacca
	grāhebhya ca ' is not	University Ms No 2713
	found in the <i>Nara-</i>	(fol 93 ^a)
	<i>simha-p</i>	
p 141	= 63, 3-4, 18,	<i>Daṇḍāgiri</i>
	5 and 63, 5-6	of Vallabāsena
p 153	= 58, 98 ^b -99 ^a ,	fol. 20 ^b = 58, 51 ^a -52 ^a
	100 ^a and 101 ⁱ	" 24 ⁱ = 58, 78 ⁱ -82
p 162	= 58, 11 ^b and	" 124 ^b = 30, 36.
	13 ^b	Three lines from ' kapī-
p 189	= 58, 109-110 ^a	lām laksanopetām ' do
	The line ' nityamanam	not occur in the <i>Nara-</i>
	śavain drstva ', which is	<i>simha-p</i>
	not found in the printed	" 130 ^a = 30, 36
	ed. of the <i>Narasimha-p</i> ,	" 137 ^b = 30, 33 ^b
	occurs in the Dacca	" 168 ^b = 30, 35.
	University Ms No 2713,	" 174 ⁱ - ⁱⁱ = 34 50 ^a , 49 ^a ,
	fol. 92 ^a (chap 55)	etc
p. 951	= 58, 36	Many verses are not
	The verses ' agārād abhi	found in the <i>Narasimha-</i>
	niṣkrāntah ' and ' agādī-	<i>p</i>
	visayāśunga ' are not	" 180 ^b = 30, 34 ^a .
	found in the <i>Narasimha-</i>	" 223 ^a = 30, 37 ^b
	<i>p</i> .	" 232 ^b = 30, 40 ^b .

- Narasimha-p*
- fol. 276^b = 30 32
 „ 292^b (twice) = 34, 39^a and 39^a, 34, 37^b-38
- The line 'gavām saha-
 ara-dānena' which is
 not found in the printed
 ed., occurs in the Dacca
 University Mss Nos.
 284A (fol 57^b), 223
 (fol 51^a) and 2713
 (fol. 44^a)
- 3 *Smṛti-candrikā*
 of Devanabhata,
 I, p 178 = 58, 34^b
 II, pp. 341-2 = 30, 12
 p. 353 = 58, 58^b-59^a
- The lines 'upāsya paści-
 mām samdhyam' and
 'gavāntrīm abhvaśet
 tavat' are not found in
 the *Narasimha-p*
- p 485 = 58, 65.
 p 488 —This verse occurs
 in chap 55 of the
 Dacca University
 Ms No. 2713
 (fol. 90^b).
- p 528 = 58, 91^b-93^a
 p. 531 = 58, 92^b-93^a.
 p. 540 = 34, 7
 pp. 540-1 = 34, 17^b-18^a
 pp. 541-2 —These 13 verses,
 which are not found
 in the printed ed.,
 occur in the Dacca
 University Mss. See
 Appendix II (B).
- Narasimha-p.*
- p. 548 — Given in foot-
 note 2 on p.
 103 of the
 printed ed.
- p. 561 = 58 93.
- 4 *Madana-pūrvagāthā*
 of Madanapala,
 p 298 = 58, 91^b-93^a.
 pp 301-2 —These 16 verses
 occur in the Dacca
 University Mss.
 See Appendix II
 (B)
- Some of these verses
 resemble *Nar* 34,
 18^b, 21, 23^b-24^a and
 27^b.
- 5 *Kṛtyacāra*
 of Śrīdatta Upa-
 dhyāya (Dacca
 University Ms
 No 4339),
 fol 6^b-7^a —This verse occurs
 in chap. 55 of the
 Dacca University
 Ms No 2713 (fol.
 90^b)
- „ 13^b (twice) = 58, 46^b-47.
 (The line 'tintanī venu-
 prsthām ca' is not
 found in the *Nara-
 simha-p*)
 58, 49^a
- fol 14^b = 58, 50^b-52^a.
 „ 15^a = 58, 58^b-59^a.
 „ 28^b = 58, 72^b-73
 „ 37^b-38^a = 58, 77, 85^b
 and 87-88^a.

- | | <i>Narasimha-p.</i> | | <i>Narasimha-p.</i> |
|---|--|------------------------------|---|
| fol. 46 ^a | —refers to 58, 88-91. | p 156 | = 60, 2-4. |
| „ 58 ^b | = 28, 34 ^b -35 ^a . | p 192 | = 60, 13 ^b -14, 17d-e, 16 and 17f-g. |
| „ 60 ^b (twice) | = 32, 18, 58, 91 ^b -93 | | The lines 'caturangu- |
| „ 67 ^a | = 58, 98 ^b -99 ^a , 100 ^a and 101 ^a | | len', 'sarva-vyañjana- |
| 6 <i>Caturvarṇacintāmaṇi</i>
of Hemādri, | | | samyuktam' and 'yatei |
| I, pp 164-165 | = 30, 27 ^b -36 ^a and 39-41 ^a | | dharma-ratah' are not |
| p. 165 | = 30, 43 ^b -44 ^a | | found in the <i>Nara-</i> |
| II, i, pp. 510-512 | = 26, 2-20. | | <i>simha-p</i> |
| II, ii, p 14 | = 67, 10-11. | 8 <i>Dipa-kalikā</i> of | |
| p 521 | = 67, 8 | Sūlapāni (Dacca | |
| III, i, p. 890 | = 58, 65 | University Ms | |
| p 897 | —This verse occurs | No 602), | |
| | in chap 55 of the | fol 22 ^a | = 58, 11 ^b and 13 ^b |
| | Dacca University | | |
| | Ms. No. 2713 (fol. | 9 <i>Tīrtha-cintāmaṇi</i> | |
| | 90 ^b), | of Vācaspati- | |
| | | misra, | |
| | | p 279 | = 65 23 ^b 24 ^a |
| II, ii, p 759 | = 58, 109-110 ^a . | 10 <i>Nityācāra-paddhati</i> | |
| 7 <i>Madhavācārya's</i> | | of Vidyākara | |
| comment on the | | Vaṣapeyin, | |
| <i>Parāśara-smṛiti</i> , | | p 32 | = 8 40 |
| I, i, p 261 | = 58, 88 ^b -89 | p 61 (twice) | = 58, 51 ^b 58 50 ^b -51 ^a |
| pp 303-5 | = 58, 78 ^b -82. | p. 87 | — c: 58, 67 ^b and 71 ^b |
| | The verses 'uttamam | p. 313 | = 58, 89 |
| | mānasam japyam' and | pp 385-6 | = 15, 8 |
| | 'vācikasyaikamekam | p. 505 | = 63, 3 ^a |
| | syād' are not found in | p 511 | = 63, 2 |
| | the <i>Narasimha-p.</i> | 11 <i>Ārya-hallavanara</i> | |
| p 364 | = 58, 92 ^b -93 ^a . | of Śrīnāthācārya- | |
| p. 376 | = 58, 93 | cāntanapī (Dacca | |
| pp. 406-7 | = 58, 98 ^b -99 ^a . | University Ms | |
| p. 408 | = 58, 100-101 ^a . | No. 49), | |
| I, ii, p. 149 | = 58, 36 | fol. 81 ^a | = 58, 72 ^b -73 ^a . |
| | | p. 83 ^a | = 58, 13 ^b . |

12 *Varṣa-kaumudī* *Narasimha-p.*
of Govindānanda,

- p. 147 = 62, 6.
p. 168 — These verses occur
in the Dacca Uni-
versity Mas See
Appendix II (B)
The line 'visnave
vidhivat' and
'kalpa-kotisaha-
srāṇi' also tally
with *Nar.* 34, 27^b
and 21^b res-
pectively.

- p. 171 = 34, 24^b-25^a.
p. 174 = 62, 14^a.
p. 178 = Given in
foot-note on p. 103
of the *Narasimha-p.*
The verse 'urasā
sirasā' is not found
in the *Narasimha-p.*

- p. 199 = 62, 7^b-8^a.
pp. 200-201 = 62, 4, 17 and
8^b-15^a.
p. 251 = 58, 109^b-110.
p. 496 = 30, 32.
p. 501 = 58, 109^a-110^a.
p. 542 = 67, 8.
pp. 569-70 = 58, 11^b and
13^b.

13 *Suddhi-kaumudī*
of Govindānanda,

- p. 313 = 53, 72^b-73^a.
p. 342 — of. 58, 73-76.

14 *Śrāddha-kaumudī*
of Govindānanda,

- p. 146 = 58, 72^b-73^a.

15 *Dāma-kaumudī* *Narasimha-p.*
of Govindānanda,

- p. 51 = 30, 37^b.

16 *Smṛti-tālva*
of Raghunandana,

- I, p. 21 — of 62, 10.
p. 39 = 58, 109-110^a.
p. 110 = 67, 7
p. 146 = 67, 13-14
and 15.
p. 342 (thrice) = 58, 48^b-49^a,
47-48^a and
50^b-52^a

The line 'tintidi
etc.' is not
found in the
Narasimha-p.

- p. 364 = 58, 72^b-73^a.
p. 391 = 58, 78^b-82
p. 394 (twice) = 58, 91^b-92^a.

Three lines from
'arghyam dad-
yāt tu sūryāya'
are not found in
the *Narasimha-p.*
p. 396 = 33, 13-14.

The verse 'tato
grhārcanam
kuryāt' is not
found in the
Narasimha-p.

- p. 408 = 63, 3 and 5^a-^b:
18, 5.

The verse 'dhyā-
tvā pranava-
pūrvam tu' is
not found in the
Narasimha-p.

<i>Narasimha-p.</i>		<i>Narasimha-p.</i>	
p. 409	= 62, 14 ^a , 8, 22 6 ² , 10 The line 'sugandha-sumano dhūpa' is not found in the <i>Narasimha-p.</i>	p. 61 p. 66	= 32, 19. = 34, 18 ^b -20. —The verse 'aparyu-sitanīśhidraih' is found in the Dacca University Mss See Appendix II (B) The verse 'ketakt-patra-puspam ca' is not found in the <i>Narasimha-p</i>
p. 410	—These two lines occur in the Dacca University Mss See Appendix II (B)		
p. 411 (twice)	= 34, 18 ^b -20. —The verse 'saml-patra-sahasībh-yab', which is not found in the printed ed, occur in the Dacca University Mss. See Appendix II (B)	pp 72-73	= 18, 3 18, 5 and 8 ^{a-b} . The verses 'sarva-vedānta-sārārtha' and 'yasya yāvāms ca viśvā-sah' are not found in the <i>Narasimha-p</i>
pp 417-8	= 28, 34 ^a -35 ^a The verse 'ahany ahanyo martyo' is not found in the <i>Narasimha-p</i>	p. 76	= 28, 34 ^b -35 ^a The verse 'urasā śirasā drstyā' is not found in the <i>Narasimha-p</i>
p. 419	= 58, 93 —The verses 'apatā dhasahasrāpi' and 'anānam dānam pa-pah srāddham' are not found in the <i>Narasimha-p.</i>	p. 84 p. 284 p. 508 p. 511	= 66, 45. = 30, 29-30 ^a . = 32, 13-14 and 19 ^b -20. = 34, 11. —The line 'brahma-kūrca-vidhānena' is given in footnote 3 on p. 101 of the printed ed.
p. 456	= 66, 45		62, 14 ^a
p. 743	= 67, 13-15		
II, p. 59	= 31, 12-13.		
p. 60	= 58 48 ^b -49, 62, 14 ^a	p. 650	= 62, 14 ^a .

17 *Durga-pūjā-* *Narasimha-p.*
tattva of

Raghunandana,

p 16 = 62, 14^a.

18 *Haribhakti-vatāsa*
of Goṣālabhatta,

p 22 = 18, 33.

p. 142 = 66, 45.

p 152 = 58 92^b-93^a

p. 155 = 33, 14.

The verse 'samm
ārjanam yah kurute'
is not found in the
Narasimha-p.

p. 159 = 34, 13

p 287 = 34, 4

p 292 = 34, 5.

p 297 = 34, 6-9^a.

The verse 'duhsva-
pna-śamanam jñe-
yam' and the line
'loka-mitrāny avā
pnoti' are not found
in the *Narasimha-*
p.

p. 298 = 34, 12.

pp 300-1 = 34, 2-3, 6,
14^c-15^a and
14^a-^b.

p. 314 = 34, 16^b-17^a.

p. 318 = 34^a, 38^a-^d.

p. 326 —These three lines,
which are not fou
nd in the printed
ed, occur in the
Dacca University
Ms —See Appendix
II (B).

p. 330 = 34, 18^b-19^a
and 20

Narasimha-p.

—The three lines
'tapah-śīla-guno-
pete' etc and the
verse 'avam hi rāj-
an' occur in the
Dacca University
Mss.—See Appen-
dix II (B).

p. 331 —These five lines,
though not found
in the printed ed,
occur in the Dacca
University Mss.—
See Appendix II
(B).

pp. 331-2 —These lines occur
in the Dacca Uni-
versity Mss —Sec
Appendix II (B)

p. 354 —These lines occur
in the Dacca Uni-
versity Mss.—See
Appendix II (B)

p 377 = 34, 24^b-26

p. 382 = 34, 27-28.

p 398 = 34, 29-30.

p 403 = 34, 3 (except 31^c).

p. 408 = 34, 34^d-37^a

p 423 = 34, 34^b-^c.

p 426 —This verse is gi-
ven in foot note 2
on p. 103 of the
printed ed.

p 429 = 8, 45.

p. 432 = 34, 32-33^a.

p. 441 = 28, 34^b-35^a.

The verse 'krasnasya
paritosepsuh' is not
found in the *Nara-*
simha-p.

	<i>Narasimha-p.</i>		<i>Narasimha-p.</i>
p 544	= 9, 2-3 and 5		occurs in chap. 55 of
p. 621	= 54, 39 ^a and 39		the Dacca University
			Ms No. 2713 (fol 90 ^b)
	The lines 'asvamedha	p. 365	= 58, 77
	aya yajñasaya' and	p 387	= 58, 88.
	'gavām sahasra-	p. 496	= 7, 63-70 and
	dānasaya' are not found		74 ^a
	in the printed ed	p. 556	= 33, 13-14 ,
p 639	= 32, 18-19, 8,		34, 2-3
	21-23.	p 557	= 34, 34 ^d -35 and
p 663	= 8, 31.		37 ^a .
p. 688	= 8, 27	pp 558-560	= 34, 12, 6-11
p. 728	= 8, 29		and 13-16 ^a .
p 1099	= 58, 78 ^b -82.		The line 'brahma-kūroa-
p, 1117	= 32, 13		vidhānena' is given in
p 1175	= 32, 14, 15		foot-note 3 on p. 101 of
	and 20		the printed ed.
	The verse 'sakāmo		Eight lines from 'gāya-
	narasimhaeva' is not		tryā caiva gomūtram' to
	found in the <i>Nara-</i>		'dadhni vāyuh sadā
	<i>simha-p</i>		devah' are not found in
p 1290	= 32, 12.		the <i>Narasimha-p.</i>
19 <i>Nityācāra-pradīpa</i>		p. 599	= 28, 24 ^b -35 ^a .
of Narasimha			Also refers to the con-
Vajapeyin,			tents of chap. 28 of the
p 187	= 58, 80-82 and		<i>Narasimha-p.</i>
	79 ^b	p. 607	= 34, 17 ^b -18 ^a .
p. 238	= 8, 40	p. 615	—These three
p. 261	— This verse		verses occur in the
	occurs in chap. 55 of the		Dacca University Mss.
	Dacca University Ms.		See Appendix II (B).
	No 2713 (fol. 90 ^b)	p. 616	— The verses
p 283	= 58, 47.		'drona-puspa' and
	The line 'tintidi venu-		'etasā ca' occur in the
	prsthā ca' is not found		Dacca University Mss
	in the <i>Narasimha-p.</i>		See Appendix II (B).
p. 286	= 58, 50 ^b -52 ^a		
p. 287	= 58, 51 ^b .		
p. 310	— This verse		

Narasimha-p.

There is also reference to the contents of some of the verses given in Appendix II (B).

- p 617 = 34, 18^b-19^a and 20
The line 'etais ca nityam' is not found in the *Narasimha-p.*
p. 644 = 34, 24^b-26
p. 649 = 34, 27-28.
p 665 = 34, 29-30
pp 676-7 = 34, 31^a-e
p. 697 = 34, 16^b-17^a, 37^b-38 and 39^b-e.

—The last verse is not found in the *Narasimha-p*

- p 729 = 63, 6-8^b and 5^b

20 *Kālasāra* of Gadādhara,

- p. 323 —This line, which is not found in the printed ed., occurs in chap 55 of the Dacca University Ms No. 2713 (fol 92^a).

Narasimha-p.

- p 507 = 58, 50^b-51^a

21 *Vidhāna-pārijāta* of Anantabhatta,

- I, pp. 592-6 = 34, 49^a, 49^b-51^a, 44^a, 48, 44^b-45^a, 46-47, 45^b, 51^b-54, and 55. 35, 1-5^a and 6^b-25

The verses 'hasantīm pratimām drstva' and 'tathā mahājvaragraste', which are not found in the printed ed., occur in the Dacca University Ms Nos 284A (fol 58^a), 323 (fol 51^b). the line 'prasveda-yuktām' is not found in this Ms), and 2713 (fol 44^b).

The line 'bhaktyā prapūṣayet' is not found in the *Narasimha-p.*

APPENDIX IV

The quotations made from the '*Narasimha-p*' (or '*Nṛsiṃha-p.*' or '*Nārasimha*') in the following works are not found in the present *Narasimha-p*

- (1) *Dānasāgara*, fol 173^b
- (2) *Madana-pārijāta*, p 211.
- (3) *Calurvaṅga-śaṅkṛānta*, II, ii, pp 41-4¹, 375, 376-7 (?), 381-2. III, i, pp 245, 432-3, 680, 702-3, 720, 738, 929-930. III, ii, pp 505, 673, 852
- (4) *Dīpa-kalāṅkā* (Dacca University Ms No 602), fol 97^b.
- (5) *Śraddha-vṛska* (Dacca University Ms No 151A), fol 2^a
- (6) *Vṛata-kāla-vṛeka* (Dacca University Ms No 1578^c) fol. 3^b.
- (7) *Tithi-vṛeka* (Dacca University Ms No 403D), fol. 4^b
- (8) *Nityacāra-paddhati*, pp. 495, 505-6, 530
- (9) *Śraddha-kaumudī*, p. 100
- (10) *Smṛti-tatva*, I, pp 351, 414, 415, 762, 827, II, p. 628
- (11) *Haribhakti-ulāsa* pp. 156, 431, 660 710.
- (12) *Nityacāra-pradīpa*, pp 181, 512
- (13) *Kālasāra*, p 145.
- (14) *Vedhāna-pārijāta*. I, p. 451

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF INDIAN PLANTS—
HISTORY OF CANAKA (GRAM) AS FOOD FOR
HORSES—BETWEEN C. A. D. 800 AND 1870
TOGETHER WITH SOME NOTES ON THE
IMPORT OF FOREIGN HORSES
INTO INDIA IN ANCIENT AND
MEDIAEVAL TIMES

BY

P K. GODE

A friend of mine in the Bombay Agricultural Department, who was interested in the history of several Indian crops, once asked me if I could study the history of *Canaka* or *gram* used by men and horses in India to-day. I promised him to write some paper on *Canaka* and its antiquity on the strength of Indian sources. I put a counter-question to my friend *Can you tell me when Canaka or gram came to be used as food for horses?* My friend could not answer this question for want of evidence. I, therefore, propose to record in this paper some evidence which throws some light on this question from the Sanskrit and non-Sanskrit sources available to me.

Yule and Burnell have recorded some useful information on *Gram* or *Canaka* in the *Hobson-Jobson*, London, 1903, pp. 392-393 as follows:—

GRAM S.—This word is properly the Portuguese *grão* i. e. 'grain' but it has been specially appropriated to that kind of vetch (*cicer arctinum*, L.) which is the most general grain—(rather pulse-) food for horses all over India, called in H. *Chana*. It is the Ital *cece*, Fr. *pois chiche*, Eng. *chick-pea* or Egypt. *pea* much used in France and S. Europe. This specific application of *grão* is also Portuguese as appears from Bluteau. The word *gram* is in some parts of India applied to other kinds of pulse, and then this application of it is recognized by qualifying it as *Bengal gram*. (See remarks under CALAVANCE). The plant exudes oxalate of potash, and to walk through a gram-field in a wet morning is destructive to shoe-leather. The natives collect the acid."

II [*Annals*, B. O. R. I.]

The following dated usages of the word GRAM are then recorded in the *Hobson-Jobson* :—

A. D. 1513—"And for the food of these horses (exported from the Persian Gulf) the factor supplied grāos"

—*Albuquerque, Cartas* p 200

Letter of December 4.

A. D. 1554—(Describing Vijayanagar)—"There the food of horses and elephants consists of grāos, rice and other vegetables cooked with jagra, which is palm-tree sugar, as there is no barley in that country"

—*Castanheda*, Bk. ii, Ch. 16

C A. D. 1610—"They give them also a certain grain like lentils"

—*Pyrard de Laval*. Hak. Soc. ii, 79.

A. D. 1703—"...he confessing before us that their allowance three times a week is but a quart of rice and gram together for five men a day, but promises that for the future it shall be rectified"

—In *Wheeler*, ii, 10.

A. D. 1776—".....Lentils.....gram.....mustard seed"

—*Halhed's Code*, p. 8 (Pt. ii).

A D 1789—"gram, a small kind of pulse, universally used instead of oats"

—*Munros's Narrative*, 85.

A. D. 1793—"gram which it is not customary to give to bullocks in the Carnatic"

—*Durron's Narrative*, 97.

A. D 1804—"The gram alone for the four regiments with me has in some months cost 50,000 pagodas"

—*Wellington*, iii, 71

A. D. 1865—"But they had come at a wrong season, gram was dear, and prices low and the sale concluded in a dead loss"

—*Palgrave's Arabia*, 290.

Gram-fed—adj Properly the distinctive description of mutton and beef fattened upon gram which used to be the pride of Bengal. But applied figuratively to any 'pampered creature'.

in the article on CALAVANCE (*Hobson-Jobson*, p. 145) we are told that the word *Calavance* comes from the Span. *grabanos*, which De Candolle mentions as Castilian for ' *pous chuche* ' or *cicer arietinum* (= gram)

The above usages of *gram* as food for horses and men, take its history upto A. D. 1513. I shall now trace this history backward from A. D. 1513.

Narahari in his medical glossary called the *Rājanighantu*¹ composed in Kashmir C. A. D. 1450² refers to चणक or gram as "वाजिभक्ष" (food for horses) in the following verse:—

“ चणस्तु हरिमन्थः स्यात् हृगन्धः कृष्णकञ्जुकः ।
बालभोज्यो वाजिभक्षश्चणकः कञ्जुकी च सः ॥ ”

In the two special treatises on horses, which are definitely earlier than Narahari's *Rājanighantu* we get some references to *Canaka* as food for horses. These treatises are (1) अश्ववैद्यक³ of महासाहस्य जयदत्त and (2) अश्वचिकित्सित⁴ of नकुल.

References to चणक in the अश्ववैद्यक of जयदत्त are as follows —

Page 106 (chap. 11 — इन्द्रयमात्रा विवरणम्)

“ चणकाश्चैव माषाश्च ये चाग्रे व्रीहयस्तथा ।
यवाश्चैनं प्रयोक्तव्या देशसाम्भवेन स्वादने ॥ १ ॥ ”

Here चणक or gram is definitely prescribed for the regimen of horses along with यव,⁵ माष, and व्रीहि. The editor in explaining the above observes:—

¹ Quoted on p. 212 of अष्टाङ्गहृदयकोष by K. M. Vaidya, Trichur, 1936.

² *Hobson Jobson* (p. 476) refers to *Kitchery* (खिचड़ी) as food for horses — “ c. 1475 Horses are fed on *pease*, also on *Kichiris*, boiled with sugar and oil etc ” — *Abdurrazak in India in 15th Century*, p. 10 — Does “ *pease* ” here mean *chick-peas* or चणक ?

³ Edited by Umesā Chandra Gupta in *Bibliotheca Indica*, Calcutta, 1886, pages 335. A Glossary of Indian Drugs mentioned by Jayadatta, together with their Bengali, Hindi and Latin synonyms, is given by the Editor at the end of this edition. In this glossary अहिकेन or opium is mentioned on p. 3.

⁴ Edited by Umesā Chandra Gupta, Bib. Indica, 1887 pages 63.

⁵ हेमचन्द्र (A. D. 1088-1172) in his lexicon अग्निधानचिन्तामणि (भूमिकापत्र, 236) mentions यव as the favourite of horses — “ यवो हयप्रियः ” (Comm. “ हयानां प्रियः हयप्रियः ”). He refers to चणक in verse 237 as “ चणको हरिमन्थकः ” and explains “ चणति हयमानः चणकः ” and “ हरिमि, मन्थने हरिमन्थकः ” *Amarakośa* mentions दासीक horses and हरिमन्थक (= चणक).

“ बाजिनां भोजनार्थं यवादीनां एवं मात्रा; एकदिने यवस्य आढक-
चतुष्टयं । चणकमाषव्रीह्यादीनां आढकद्वयं मात्रा । सुहस्य च प्रस्थत्रयं । यत्र
यत्र भोजने स्नेहव्यवस्था सर्वत्रैव स्नेहस्य कुडबत्रयं लवणस्य कुडबो देवः । ”

Then the editor quotes the following verse from अग्निपुराण :—

“ चणकव्रीहिमौहानि कलायं बापि दापयेत् ।

अहोरात्रेण चार्द्धस्य यवसस्य तुला दश ॥

अष्टौ गुल्फस्य दातव्याश्चतस्रोऽथ वुषस्य वा । ”

इति अग्निपुराणम् । एव माषभोजनेऽपि माषस्य ३ प्रस्था । तैलस्य ३ कुडबाः ।
लवणस्य च कुडबः ॥ ”

Chapter 13 deals with the treatment of horses in different seasons (सर्ष-ऋतु-उपचार) Special attention is given to the food¹ of the horses in these seasons. Among articles of food for the autumn (शरत्) we find मांसयव (meat-broth) and for the winter (हेमन्त) some wine (वारुणी) also. Wine (मदिरा) is also pre-
scribed for the spring (वसन्त). In chapter 22 dealing with treat-
ment of horses for removing fatigue (भ्रान्तोपचार) मांस रस or flesh
juice is prescribed along with यव (barley). In chapter 40 dealing
with the treatment of horses in fever (ज्वरविवरण) मांसरस-ओदन or
rice boiled with flesh juice is prescribed. Chapter 66 (रसोनकल्प)
prescribes the several uses of garlic in 23 verses Garlic is said
to be specially beneficial to old horses (दृद्धेषु च विशेषेण रसोनञ्च
प्रदापयेत्) References to चणक as food for horses in the अष्टविधिमस्ति
of नकुल are as follows :—

Page 39— chapter 11 (ऋतुचर्या) prescribes the use of gram
(चणक) in the absence of यव in the following verse —

“ यवोऽथ यवस दद्यादेकविंशत्यहानि च ।

यवाऽभावेऽथ चणकान् दद्यादाह्नतरान् सदा ॥ १० ॥ ”

नकुल praises why much the use of यव for feeding the horses as
follows :—

“ देवतानां यथा विष्णुर्ब्रह्मा वेदविदां वरः ।

नवीनाञ्च यथा गङ्गा तथा श्रेष्ठा यवा हये ॥ १४ ॥ ”

¹ Cf. *Asin-t-Akbari* (A D 1590) (Blochmann) Vol. I (1873)—*Asin* 49
on Imperial Horse Stables—The regimen includes peas, grain, flour, sugar,
fresh grass, ghee, hay, molasses, salt, Brown sugar, green oats for regular
horses—Regimen for foals includes milk of Cows,

यव had been the sustainer of the Aryans from Vedic times and consequently नकुल lavishes so much praise on it. The Vedic Aryans' may have used यव for their horses. नकुल and जयदत्त prescribe यव as food for horses. यवस is prescribed by नकुल for horses. Keith in his *Vedic Index* (Vol. II, p. 117) states that " यवस in the R̥gveda and later denotes the 'grass' on which animals feed and which is burnt by the forest fire."

Page 42— नकुल continues his praise of यव in the following lines :—

“ परीक्षाग्नौ यथा हेमः स्नेहस्य च प्रतिक्रिया ।
हयजीवस्य तद्वच्च परीक्षा यवमक्षणे ॥ ३२ ॥
यथा सापान्त्रिकं वार गन्धोच्चैः स्वस्थतां ब्रजेत् ।
तद्वत् यवाशनोत्तीर्णाः सुखदेहा हयोत्तमाः ॥ ३३ ॥

Page 43— When नकुल wrote his treatise चणक had attained quite an important status in the regimen of the horses. In fact it was considered as the *second best* grain for horses (next to यव) as will be seen from the following verse—

“ यवाऽभावेऽथ चणका धान्यमन्यतमं वरम् । ”
“ एते दुष्टियुगाः प्रोक्ताश्चणकाहारजा इये । ”

In the detailed regimen of horses Kautilya mentions numerous items except चणक. I am, therefore, inclined to suggest that चणक was not used as food for horses in Kautilya's time. The question now arises as regards the exact time when चणक came to be used as food for horses or “ बाजिमक्ष ”. It appears that when नकुल wrote his treatise the use of चणक was getting into vogue as food for horses. We must now find references to चणक as food for horses in sources earlier than the time of जयदत्त and नकुल, the authors of

1 In the *Vedic Index* (Vol I —“ अथ,” Keith and Macdonell do not refer to the use of यव for horses. In the *Arthasāstra* Kautilya refers to यव in the regimen for horses in his chapter on अश्वपुष्टि (Book II chap. 30) p. 147 of Eng. Trans. by Shamsastry, 1929

“ For the best horse (the diet shall be) two *dronas* of any one of the grains, rice (शालि, व्रीहि), barley (यव), *panis* seeds (पियङ्गु) soaked or cooked, *mudga* (*Phaseolus Mango*), or *Māya* (*Phaseolus Radiatus* ; one *prastha* of oil, 5 *palas* of salt, 50 *palas* of flesh, one *ādḥaka* of broth (*rasa*), or two *ādḥakas* of curd, 5 *palas* of sugar (*Kṣāra*), to make their diet relishing one *prastha* of *surā* liquor or two *prasthas* of milk. ”

There is no reference to चणक in the *Word-Index* to the *Arthasāstra*.

अश्ववेद्यक and अश्वचिकित्सित respectively. But what is the time of जयदत्त and नकुल? In connection with this question the following data may be recorded :—

(1) In the Vedic times "Horses from the Indus were of special value, as also horses from Sarasvatī (see p. 43 of *Vedic Index* (Keith and Macdonell))

(2) The *Arthashastra* of Kautilya (p. 148 of Eng. Trans., 1929) mentions the following varieties of horses.—

(i) *Kāmboja*, (ii) *Sindhū*, (iii) *Aratta* and (iv) *Vanāyū*—
These are the *best* breeds and (v) *Bāhlika*, (vi) *Pāpeya*,
(vii) *Sauvīra* and (viii) *Tātala* are breeds of *muddle* quality

(3) जयदत्त in chap. VI of his अश्ववेद्यक mentions the following kinds of horses —

Best kinds — (1) ताजिक (Arabian horses)

(2) पारसिक (Persian)

(3) केकाण or कोङ्कण

Other kinds are (4) तुरी जाता or तुरुष्का, (5) कीरा, (6) सूकृष्ठा, (7) भाण्डजाः, (8) पार्ष्वता, (9) सैन्यवा, (10) सारस्वता, (11) सम्भला, (12) कुशा, (13) जटदेशोद्भवा, (14) प्राम्दक्षिणोद्भवा, (15) पल्लदेशोद्भवा, (16) दक्षिणात्याः, (17) पूर्वदेशसमुद्भवा etc

(4) नकुल in chap II of his अश्वचिकित्सित mentions the following kinds of horses —

Best kinds — (1) ताजिका (Arabian)

(2) खुरशाणा (Khorasān)

(3) उत्तरा (variant तुवारा)

Other kinds — (4) मोजिशाणा, (5) केकाणा, (6) घोडाहारा (variant पोपहारा), (7) भाण्डजाः, (8) राजगूलाः, (9) गोह्वराः, (10) शाबरा, (11) सिन्धुपाराः.

The above list of numerous kinds of horses known to Indians in the time of जयदत्त and नकुल contains a eulogy of ताजिक (Arabian), पारसिक (Persian) and some other foreign breeds of horses like तुरुष्क (Turkish) and खुरशाण (Khorasān) varieties. This popularity of *Persian Turkish*, *Khorasan*, *Arabian* and other foreign breeds clearly shows that the importation of foreign horses into India was an established feature of foreign commerce with India at the time when जयदत्त and नकुल composed their treatises on horses.

(5) *Marco Polo in his Travels*¹ (A. D. 1298) records some references to horses of different countries as follows :—

*Page 28—Horses in Turkomania.*² Marco Polo observes :—

"There is here an excellent breed of horses which has the appellation of *Turki* and fine mules which are sold at high prices." The Turki breed of horses is esteemed throughout the East for spirit and hardiness. (Compare तुक्क horses mentioned by जयदत्त).

Page 50—Horses in Persia

"The country is distinguished for its excellent breed of horses many of which are carried for sale to India and bring high prices not less in general than two hundred livres tournois."³

"The traders of these parts convey the horses to Kisi to Ormus, and to other places on the coast of the Indian sea, where they are purchased by those who carry them to India. In consequence, however, of the greater heat of that country, they do not last many years, being natives of a temperate climate."

Page 134—Horses of Tartars fed on grass alone.

The Tartars "are capable of supporting every kind of privation, and when there is a necessity for it can live for a month on the milk of their mares and upon such wild animals as they may chance to catch. Their horses are fed upon grass alone and do not require barley or other grain (contrast the Indian regimen for horses consisting of यव, चणक and मांसद्वय mentioned in the अश्ववैद्यक and अश्वचिकित्सित of जयदत्त and नकुल and the rich diet for horses given by the *Arthashastra* in its chapter on अश्वारण्य).

¹ Ed by Thomas Wright, London, 1901.

² "Turkomania" then comprised the possessions of the great Seljuk dynasty in Asia Minor, says the Editor, Mr. Wright.

³ Wright observes — The excellence of the Persian horses, for which they may perhaps be indebted to the mixture of the Arabian and Turki breed, is well known. A detailed account of their qualities is given by Chardin (tom ii, chap. viii, p 25, 4 to), and also by Malcolm (*Hist. of Persia* Vol ii, p. 516) As the *live tournois*, in the 14th cent was at the proportionate value of 25 to 1 livre of the present times, it follows that, the price at which the Persian horses sold in India was from 1500 to 2000 rupees."

Cf. Vincent Smith (*History of India*, Oxford, 1914, p. 426)—King Pulakesin II of the Deccan sent an embassy to Khusru II of Persia in A. D. 625. Khusru sent a return embassy to Pulakesin. A picture of this return embassy is found on an Ajanta fresco painting in Cave No. 1.

"The men are habituated to remain on horse-back during two days and two nights, without dismounting, sleeping in that situation whilst their horses graze "

Page 262—*Horses bred in Karavan*¹

—'The best horses are bred in this province', (Wright observes:— "This is probably the same breed as the *tangun* or *tanyan* horses of lower Tibet, carried from thence for sale to Hindustan. The people of Būtan informed Major Rennell that they brought their *tanyans* thirty-five days journey to the frontier" (cf. जयदत्त mentions टङ्गुण breed —"वर्तुलभ्रापि हस्वश्च टङ्गुणः परिकीर्तितः")

Page 266— *Horses bred in Karazan*

"In this province the horses are of a large size and whilst young are carried for Sale to India. It is the practice to deprive them of one joint of the tail, in order to prevent them from lashing it from side to side, and to occasion its remaining pendant, as the whisking it about, in riding, appears to them a vile habit ".

Page 386— *No horses are bred in Muaban but they are imported from Arabia*

—"No horses being bred in this country the king and his three royal brothers expend large sums of money annually in the purchase of them from merchants of *Ormus*, *Dufar*, *Pecher* and *Adem* etc. "

—"The climate of the province is unfavourable² to the race of horses."

¹ Wright states that *Karavan* is generally understood to be north-western part of *yun-nan*. Dr F. Buchanan (*Asiatic Researches*, Vol. iv, p. 228) writes this word as *Karavn*. He also speaks of *Ka-Kiavn* a wild people on the frontiers of China. जयदत्त mentions a breed of horses of the name केकण (variants काङ्गुण, केकन, केकण,). नकुल also mentions the केकण breed. Has केकण or its phonetic variants any connection with *Ka-Kiavn* people on the frontiers of China, mentioned by Buchanan ?

² Wright states that *Karazan* is another province of *Yun-nan*—It appears that the practice of docking the tails of horses by separating one or more of the vertebrae, which has become so common in England existed many hundred years ago amongst the people of *Yun-nan*, in the remotest part of China—Chinese pronunciation of *Karazan* would be *Ka-la-Shan*.

³ Wright observes — "Even at the present day there is no breed of horses in the Southern part of the peninsula, and all the cavalry employed
(continued on the next page)

—" For food they give them flesh dressed with rice, and other prepared meats, the country not producing any grain besides rice."

Page 420—Horses exported to India from Kanan or Tana.

—" They likewise take on board a number to horses to be carried for sale to different parts of India."

Page 439—Horses from Aden exported to India,

" In this port of Aden, likewise, the merchants ship a greater number of Arabian horses, which they carry for sale to all the kingdoms and islands of India, obtaining high prices for them and making large profits " (cf. the statement of जयदत्त and नकुल that तान्जिक or Arabian horse belongs to the best class of horses.)

Page 443—Horses exported to India from Kalayāt¹ or Kalatu to India

" Its harbour is good, and many trading ships arrive there from India ... These likewise carry away freights of horses, which they sell advantageously in India."

It is clear from the foregoing references of A. D. 1298 about the importation of Persian, Arabian, Turkish and other breeds of horses to India that these horses enjoyed a wide popularity in Indian kingdoms and that this Indo-foreign trade in horses was already an established feature of the commercial relations of India with other countries. It is on this account that we find a definite mention of पारसिक, तुर्क and तान्जिक horses in the treatises on horses by जयदत्त and नकुल.

(continued from the previous page)

there are foreign." जयदत्त also considers the horses bred in the Eastern and Southern country as अधम or of low quality —

" अधमाष्टङ्गणैः सार्द्धं द्वये प्राग्दक्षिणोद्भवाः ॥ "

" दक्षिणान्यो भवेदुण्डो योऽधन्यः सर्ववाजिनाम् ॥ १७ ॥

जयहीना महादुष्टाः पूर्वदेशसमुद्भवाः । "

¹ Wright observes — " Horses were carried from the Red Sea, Persian Gulf, and places in their vicinity to the northern parts of India, from whence their breed was exported to the southern provinces. Such at least appears to have been the course of the traffic before it was disturbed by European influence."

² Kalayāt is Kathāt, on the Coast of Oman, not far to the southward of Muscat.

(6) The Western Cālukya King सोमेश्वर composed his encyclopaedic Sanskrit work मानसोल्लास¹ about A. D. 1130 i. e. about 168 years earlier than Marco Polo's *Travels*. In this work there is a chapter on बाजिबाह्याली विनोद or the game on *Indian Polo*.² The king should understand the kinds of the best horses for this game brought before him by his officers (तेषां जातीः परीक्षित देशनाम-विभेदतः) Someśvara then names the following classes of horses

Best Horses—(1) काम्बोज, (2) पवन, (3) तेजी, (4) बाल्हीक, (5) आतल (6) तासखारक, (7) केकाण, (8) घोहार, (9) कान्दलेय, (10) योघेय, (11) बाज-देयक, (12) घनायुज, (13) पारसीक.

Middle Breeds—(14) तैलिल, (15) बत्स, (16) काम्बार, (17) बामतेय, (18) सेन्धव, (19) सावित्र, (20) पार्थतेय, (21) काश्मीर, (22) साम्बतीयक, (23) तजी, (24) कुलज, (25) नीहार, (26) सारस्वत, (27) तुरुष्क.

Inferior Breeds—(28) मेदक, (29) आर्जुनेय, (30) जैगर्त, (31) गुर्जर, (32) राजस, (33) आबन्ध, (34) सौराष्ट्र, (35) पारियात्र, (36) सहारक, (37) दुग्धबाट, (38) स्तम्भबाट etc.

It will be seen from the above list that many foreign breeds of horses such as पारसीक, तुरुष्क, तोख्खारक, केकाण, बाल्हीक, तेजी etc. were considered best horses about A. D. 1130, when Someśvara ruled in the Deccan. The question of the identification of all these breeds of horses mentioned by सोमेश्वर, as also those mentioned in other works will have to be considered separately as such identification has a direct bearing on the history of foreign commerce with India.

In the बाजिबाह्याली (Indian Polo) chapter referred to above there is no occasion for सोमेश्वर to mention the food for the horses. Accordingly there is no mention of चणक or gram in it³

¹ Ed. by G. K. Shrigondekar, G. O. S. Baroda, Vol II, 1939.

² Ibid, pp. 211-224—बाजिबाह्याली विनोद—It is worth while comparing the horse-lore in this chapter with that in the horse-treatises of जयचन and नकुल. See also Mr. G. K. Shrigondekar's paper on "Indian Polo" in the Proceedings of the Indian Ori. Conference, Allahabad of 1926.

³ I note here some references to चणक and its uses found in the मानसोल्लास Vol. II (Baroda) 1939—

P. 10—चणकोदन (rice boiled with gram) used for वास्तुपशमन.

P. 115—Chapter on अन्नयोग—चणक to be used in cookery after grinding it in a धरट्ट—हरिमन्थ (= चणक) pulse fried with spices (p. 119),

P. 261—Chapter on मृद्विष विनोद—चणक pulse to be given to the buffaloes used for fight,

(7) The lexicon *Amarakośa* mentions सैन्यव as the name of a horse (see क्षत्रियवर्ग of Kānda II of *Amarakośa*, ed. by N. G. Sardesai and H. D. Sharma). It mentions also four breeds of horses as follows—

P. 185—“४६—बनायजाः पारसीकाः काम्बोजा बाल्हिका इयाः” The commentator क्षीरस्वामिन् explains :—“एते जाताः इयविशेषाः । एवं तुक्स्वाराद्युपोऽपि”

The *Amarakośa* (Between A. D. 500 and 800) refers to the पारसीक or Persian horses. This reference is important as it is one of the earliest references to पारसीक horses we have so far recorded. क्षीरस्वामिन् adds the तुक्स्वार breed to the four breeds mentioned by *Amara*. The date of क्षीरस्वामिन् is about A. D. 1050.

(8) The *Brhatsamhitā* of Varāhamihira (C. A. 500) contains a small section on अश्वलक्षण (chap. 66 in 5 verses) but it mentions no breeds of horses in it though it mentions चणक.

(9) Narahari in his medical glossary called राजानिचण्डु of C. A. D. 1450 refers to the following breeds¹ of horses :—

(1) आरट्ट, (2) सिन्धुज, (3) बनायुज, (4) पारसीक, (5) कांबोज, (6) बाल्हिक, (7) माझाण, (8) दोफक.

(10) During the Polonnaruva period of the history of Ceylon (A. D. 1017-1235) horses, chariots and elephants were used at times in warfare but an army of which they formed part was rather the exception than the rule because there were no convenient routes to follow in a thickly wooded country like Ceylon. The soldiers as a rule travelled on foot and the generals were carried in palanquins with parasols held over them as a sign of their authority² Ceylon's trade with the West began

(continued from the previous page)

P. 273—Chapter on मत्स्य विनोद् (Angling) — Balls of चणक पिष्ट or gram flour with boiled rice to be used for feeding fishes

Pages 183-236—Boar-hunt (व्राह्म भुज्या) is described Boars are very fond of चणक (सुकराः चणकोत्सवाः) — several uses of चणक for tempting the boars before the king hunted them are described.

The foregoing references clearly prove that in A. D. 1180 the use of चणक or gram for feeding buffaloes and boars was an established practice.

¹ Vide p. 35 of अष्टांगहृदयकोष by K. M. Valdiya, Trichur, 1936—राजनिचण्डु is quoted here as follows :—

“आरट्टसिन्धुजवनायुजपारसीक—

काम्बोजबाल्हिकमुखा विविधास्तुरंगाः ।

साम्राज्यशेफकमुखा अपि देशतः स्युः”

² Vide p. 91 of *Early History of Ceylon*, by G. C. Mendis, 1938.

very early. It is not certain whether the Arabs had dealings with Ceylon before the Christian Era. From the 2nd century A. D. to the early part of the 3rd century Greek traders came to Ceylon. There was a revival of trade after Constantine (A. D. 323-337) who made Byzantium the capital of the Roman Empire. Persians, who were Christians of the Nestorian sect also traded with the South-west of India and Ceylon but their trade ceased in the 7th century when Persia was captured by the Muslims. The conquest of Alexandria by the Caliphs in A. D. 638 stopped Ceylon's direct trade with Byzantine Empire. Before the end of the 10th century the Arabs established a trading settlement in Colombo.¹ In view of these circumstances it is doubtful if any foreign breeds of horses were imported to Ceylon as they were imported to India from Persia and Arabia say from A. D. 800 onwards.

(11) We have already seen that जयदत्त and नकुल have stated that the breeds of horses from the दक्षिणाव्य and पूर्व (Southern and Eastern) countries or provinces were of the most inferior quality (अश्व). During the rule of the Pala dynasty in Bengal (A. D. 750-1200) cavalry was not neglected because they had to fight with Pratihāras who were strong in cavalry. Bengal had no good breed of horses. Horses were imported from foreign countries. It is said in the Mongyr plate of Devapāla (A. D. 810-850) that the horses met their old mares in the Kāmboja country. Kāmboja was reputed for the finest breed in ancient times.²

(13) Dr. B. C. Law in his learned article³ on "Animals in Early Jain and Buddhist Literature" recently published records the following interesting information⁴ about horses gathered from the *Jātakas*:-

¹ Ibid, pp 73-74.

² Vide p 143 of *Early History of Bengal*, by P. L. Paul, Calcutta, 1939.

³ *Indian Culture*, Vol. XII (July-Sept 1945), pp. 6-7.

⁴ Dr. A. D. Pusalker has drawn my attention to the following references to Horses in Dr. B. C. Law's *Tribes in Ancient India* (B. O. R. Institute, 1944):- "Horse-dealers figure prominently amongst the Gandhāra trades and we learn from the *अश्वदत्त* that the Gandhāran horses were considered the best of all (ch. 99) (Page 17) — "Horse dealers from northern districts used to bring horses to Benares for sale (*Jātaka II* p. 287). Sindh horses were available in Benares and were used as the royal horses of ceremony (*Jātaka II* p. 338) Law, p. 112.

"Horses—*Sindh* horses are milk-white and thorough-bred. (*Jātaka* Nos. 22, 23, 160, 211, 529, 547, 538). They are white as lilies, swift as the wind and well trained (*Ibid*, Nos 544, 266, 547). Horses like to eat pears (*Ibid*, 176). Thorough-bred horses are fed on parched rice drippings broken meats and grass and red rice-powder (*Ibid* No. 254). There are big chest-nut horses (*Suhamu Jātaka* No. 158). Horses are fierce (*Ibid* No. 115). When they become rogue they bite quiet horses, but when two rogues meet they lick each other's body (*Ibid* No. 158). The horse can also imitate men. A horse watching its tame trainer as he trampled on and on in front imitated him and limped too (*Giridanta Jātaka* No. 184.) A thorough-bred war-horse will not bathe in the same place where an ordinary horse took its bath (*Ibid* No. 25). Horses were employed for drawing state-chariots (*Ibid* No. 22) and cars (*Ibid* No. 211) Thorough-bred *Sindh* horses sheathed in mail were used for war purposes (*Ibid*, No. 23; cf. *Ibid*, No. 547). The *Valāha* and *Sindhu* are the horses of superior breed (*Barhut*, III, Pl. XXVI, fig. 136).

There was a trade in horses (*Jātaka* Nos. 4 and 5). There were valuers employed by kings to fix the proper price of horses, elephants and the like (*Ibid*, No. 5). Good horses used to fetch high prices. A high-bred foal was sold at Benares at a high price, separate price, was paid for the foal's four feet, for its tail, for its head—six purses of a thousand pieces of money, one for each (*Ibid*, No. 254). This horse could run at such a high speed that nobody could see it at all. It could run over a pond without getting its hoofs wet, and gallop over lotus leaves without even pushing one of them under water (*Ibid*, No. 254)—There was a flying horse, white all over and beaked like a crow, with hair like *muṣṭya* grass, possessed of supernatural power, able to fly through the air. From Himālaya it flew through the air until it came to Ceylon. It carried 250 men at a time (*Valāhasa Jātaka* No. 196)".

There is no reference to चणक or gram as food for horses in the above account of ancient Indian horses, though it refers to

rice, meat¹ and grass as food for horses. The breeds of horses mentioned in this account are *Valūha* and *Sindhū* only. The reference to *trade in horses* is in harmony with the references to such trade recorded by me already in this paper.

(13) In view of the Indo-foreign horse-trade referred to in the Indian and Foreign sources of history the following remarks of Geoffrey Brooke in his book, "*The Way of a Man with a Horse*" (London, 1929) on the history of the Horse and Horsemanship will be read with peculiar interest —

Chapter I — The Horse.

"Throughout the past ages to the present day we find the horse's many qualities appreciated and turned to the use of man. His courage and endurance have repeatedly been recognized as dominant factors in war and his original use for this purpose dates back to pre-historic times. Archaeological evidence proves this to have been the case in *India, Persia, Assyria, and Egypt*, where the horse was bred and trained as a means of conveyance. In 2737 B C the Chinese² are known to have made use of cavalry.

¹ Geoffrey Brooke in his book "*The Way of a Man with a horse*" (London, 1929) has dealt with the question of feeding of such horses. He prescribes eggs, milk, bread, biscuits, beer and wine for supplying nourishment in a concentrated form. *Beer, Stout and Wines* are to be given chiefly to stimulate appetite. A quart of *Beer or Stout* and $1\frac{1}{2}$ bottle of wine are to be usually given (P, 101). "A horse that does not appear to be thriving may be given a wine-glass-ful of *Cod-liver oil* in thrice the amount in treacle mixed in his feed once a day."

² Vide "*Ceremonial Usages of the Chinese*, B C. 1121, Translated by W. R. Glegell, London, 1852—This Chinese classic (3000 years old) refers to royal chariots and banners (pp. 18-26). It describes how men of the Chow Dynasty (1121 B C) paid particular regard to carriages, and then records in detail the principles of carriage building. It refers to military carriages, small carriages with one pole and a pair of horses on each side of the pole and large carriages with two shafts and an ox between them. The small carriages were used for hunting and war purposes. There were also "plain carriages" used as vehicles, drawn by ox or horse—This book then lays down the "regulations by which the people bred horses." Horses were of six kinds — (1) thorough-bred, (2) charger, (3) horse of colour, (4) roadster, (5) hunter, and (6) common-bred. There were officers to look after the Castration of horses, and officers to supervise the harnessing and unharnessing. There were other officers to manage the vicious horses.—These observations are evidently about 1000 years older than those in Kautilya's chapter on अश्वपक्ष in the अर्थशास्त्र and about 2000 years earlier than those in the treatises of जयदम and नकुल,

Amongst other places in the *Bible* we find in the *Book of Kings*, reference made to Solomon's captains, rulers of his chariots and his horsemen. The cavalry of *Alexander the Great*¹ was famous in their days throughout his many campaigns. We know too that the ancient Greeks were highly skilled horsemen and devoted much of their time in equitation. There is both sound advice and practical knowledge to be derived from *Xenophon's treatise on horsemanship*. It is interesting to note that *Herodotus* in his book *Thalia* refers to *Darius* sustaining an accident when hunting on horse-back. We know of course that the *Egyptians*, *Phoenicians* and *Romans* employed horses in chariots in addition to normal cavalry of those times.

Throughout past centuries to this day the *Arabs* have been recognized as a nation of horsemen and it is to these people and their particular breed of horse that we owe the wonderful *Thorough bred of modern times*. Among the early *British* at the time of the Roman conquest the *Iceni*² held a justly high reputation for the excellence of their horses and their horsemanship.

In mediaeval³ times good horsemanship was highly esteemed as witness the *English Knights* who won their spurs by gallantry on the field of battle."

The foregoing data gives us a glimpse into the history of Indian interest in horses and the consequent importation of foreign horses into India from very early times. We have seen already that the *Amarakośa* refers to the *Pārasika* or Persian horses. We know also that *Pulakesin II* of the Deccan sent an embassy to Persia in A. D. 625. Are we to suppose that the

¹ Alexander's favourite charger *Bucephalus* died at *Jhalum* city of the *Hydaspes* in N. India after carrying him in all his campaigns. Alexander built at this place a city in memory of his charger after his battle with *Porus*. (Vide p. 110 of *Smith's Smaller Classical Dictionary* Everyman's Library, London, 1913.)

² *Iceni* — a powerful people in Britain dwelling in the modern counties of Suffolk and Norfolk. Their revolt from the Romans under their heroic queen *Boadicea* is celebrated in history (*Ibid*, p. 277).

³ Mongol horseman under *Jenghiz Khān* (died 1227 A. D.) were celebrated for their conquests — " A Mongol on a single pony will ride from *Urga* to *Kalgan* — by the shortest route 600 miles " (Vide p. 133 of *Unknown Mongolia* by *Carruthers*, Vol. II). See article on *Mongol Army* in *JRAS*, 1943, p. 51.

Persian horses¹ began to be imported to India after A. D. 600? According to the *Bombay Gazetteer* the demand for Persian and Arabian horses arose from the scare created by Mussalman cavalry. If this statement is true to history the horse-trade from Persia and Arabia must have been started some time after the conquest of Sind by the Arabs in A. D. 712. The Arabs had made several raids on the coasts of Western India, one of these in A. D. 637 from Bahrein and Oman in the Persian Gulf plundered the Konkon coast near Thana (see Elliot and Dowson's *History*, I, pp. 415-416). In view of the above history of the trade in Persian and Arabian horses I am inclined to think that the treatises on horses by जयदत्त and नकुल viz. the अश्ववेद्यक and अश्व-चिकित्सित are later than C. A. D. 800 as they refer to the पारसीक (Persian) and तार्जिक (Arabian) horses among the best breeds of horses. These treatises were probably composed before A. D. 1300 as they show in a remarkable degree the necessity felt by

¹ According to *Bombay Gazetteer* [Vol. XII (Thana) Part II, p. 403] The Thana coast has taken a leading part in foreign commerce of Western India in the following periods of history —

- (i) B. C. 2500 — B. C. 500 — There are signs of trade with *Egypt* *Phoenicia* and *Babylon*.
- (ii) B. C. 250 — A. D. 250 — There are dealings with, perhaps settlements of, *Greeks* and *Romans*.
- (iii) A. D. 250 — 640 — There are *Persian* alliances and *Persian* settlements.
- (iv) A. D. 700 — 1200 — There are *Mussalman* trade relations and *Mussalman* settlements from *Arabia* and *Persia*.

During the reign of the great Noshervan (A. D. 531-578), the relations between Western India and Persia were extremely close. In the several lists of the articles of trade imported to India from outside before the period of the rule of the *Śilaharas* (A. D. 810-1260) I don't find any references to the import of horses. The *Gazetteer* observes (p. 431) —

"The chief trade in *Animals* was towards the close of the period (1290), a great import of horses from the *Persian Gulf* and from *Arabia*. No ships came to Thana without horses and the Thana chief was so anxious to secure them that he agreed not to trouble the pirates so long as they let him have the horses as his share of the plunder. This great demand for horses seems to have risen from the scare among the Hindu rulers of the Deccan caused by the Mussalman cavalry. As many as 10,000 horses a year are said to have been imported." Speaking of Mussalman trade (p. 444) the *Gazetteer* observes. — "The constant demand for horses kept up a close connection between the Thana and East Arabian ports and there was a considerable trade with the Zangibar coast."

the Hindu Kings¹ of the period 800-1300 A. D. of providing such manuals for the care of their cavalry with a view to combating the Mussalman trained cavalry like that used by Shiab-ud-din against Prithivirāja of Ajmer in A. D. 1191.

If चणक or gram came to be used as food for horses in India say between A. D. 800 and 1300, the period during which the above mentioned treatises on horses were composed we must investigate whether the use of चणक as food for horses has travelled to India along with the Persian and Arabian horses or otherwise. In connection with this problem it is necessary to locate references to चणक as food for horses in *Persian, Arabic and Turkish* sources prior to A. D. 800 but I must leave this task to scholars conversant with these sources I have tried in this paper to record the history of चणक or gram as food for horses *between C A D. 800 and 1870*. I propose to deal with the question of the antiquity of चणक on the strength of Sanskrit and non-Sanskrit sources on a subsequent occasion and the present paper is only an off-shoot of the main study pertaining to the history of this important grain on which horses have been fed for more than 1000 years in India.

¹ जयवत्त is called "महासामन्त" in the colophons of the different chapters of his अश्वदेयक.

Some Interesting Problems in
MAHĀBHĀRATA TEXT TRANSMISSION

BY

S. K. BELVALKAR

Problem No 3*

When Duryodhana and Arjuna came simultaneously to Kṛṣṇa in Dvārakā to ask for his assistance in the forth-coming war, Kṛṣṇa, wishing to satisfy them both, proposed (Udyoga 7. 17)

ते वा पुत्रि दुराधर्मा भवन्वेकस्य सैनिकाः ।

अवुध्यमानं सग्रामे न्यस्तशस्त्रोऽहमेकत ॥

Arjuna accepted Kṛṣṇa, alone and weaponless, and Duryodhana the ten thousand warriors of Kṛṣṇa known as the *Nārāyaṇas*. Kṛṣṇa eventually consented to become Arjuna's charioteer, and as such could only give advice, but not himself take any part in fighting. In the Bhīṣmaparvan, chapter 55 (= GK 59), we are told that Kṛṣṇa was *not* able to remain true to his word. On the third day of the battle, after a weak opening, Bhīṣma the Generalissimo of the Kauravas acquitted himself so valorously that Arjuna and the Pāṇdavas were not able to offer him any resistance, and the ranks fled away from the field disregarding Sātyaki's efforts to stem the rout. This angers Kṛṣṇa to such an extent that he leaps down from the chariot and, with the discus named *Sudarśana* in hand (55 89-92), rushes upon Bhīṣma with intent to kill him. Arjuna, however, runs after Kṛṣṇa and stops him at the tenth step (*dasamsa pade* : 55. 98), and persuades him to return, promising to fight Bhīṣma more manfully, a promise which Arjuna amply fulfils during the rest of that day and on the day following

* Problem No 1 appeared in the *Annals, BORI*, Vol. XXV, pp. 82-87, and No. 2 in *Ibid.* pp. 239-243. — The Mbh references in this essay are all to the Critical Edition unless otherwise specified

Duryodhana had all along suspected Bhīṣma (and Droṇa) of partiality for the Pāṇḍavas. Earlier on the third day of the battle, Duryodhana had said (5. 54. 35ff.),

अनुब्राह्मः पाण्डुवृता नूनं तव पितामह ।
यथेमां क्षमसे वीर बध्ममानां वरूथिनीम् ॥

.....
यदि नाहं वरित्वाज्यो युवाभ्यामिह संपुने ।
विक्रमेणानुरूपेण युध्येतां पुरुषर्षभौ ॥

Bhīṣma in reply said that the Pāṇḍavas were really invincible in battle. He would, nevertheless, do his best (6. 54. 41) :

यत्तु शक्य मया कर्तुं दृष्टेनाय नृपोत्तम ।
करिष्यामि यथाशक्ति प्रेक्षेदार्मी सबाण्धव' ॥

It was after this that Bhīṣma displayed his prowess which compelled Kṛṣṇa to break his vow. When therefore, at the end of the day and also on the following day, the Pāṇḍava side is again triumphant, poor Duryodhana, himself wounded in the battle and having lost eight of his own brothers (6. 60. 24-33), renews his complaint to Bhīṣma (6. 61. 26ff), who narrates to him what is known as the " Viśvopākhyāna " (chapters 61-64), which contains a legend about Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna being the Avatāras respectively of Nārāyaṇa the Supreme Being, and of Nara the Great Sage.¹ The narration of this legend, of course, does not materially affect the war, which resumes its wonted course the morning following.

On the ninth day of the battle we have, in all the recensions and testimonia without exception, a repetition of the whole series of events including, even Duryodhana's reproof and Bhīṣma's assurance, and culminating in Kṛṣṇa's leaping down from the chariot and rushing towards Bhīṣma, and of his returning to the charioteer's seat upon the importunities of Arjuna, who stops him, again, *daśame pade* (6. 102. 64). This time, however, Arjuna's promise to mend and fight better does not produce results, and

¹ This *Upākhyāna* refers to the doctrine of the *Four Vyūhas*, which is a sectarian dogma not known to the *Bhagavadgītā*. It is found in portions of the *Ep̥ic* generally considered relatively late.

Bhīṣma still remains the master of the field, so much so that Kṛṣṇa and the Pāṇḍavas repair that night to Bhīṣma's camp and ask his advice as to what they should do to win the battle.

Now when a battle is raging on for a number of days, there are naturally bound to be repetitions of incidents; but this incident of Kṛṣṇa's rushing upon Bhīṣma is not an ordinary incident, and it loses all its *raison d'être* by being repeated. Furthermore, if, stung by Duryodhana's reproof, Bhīṣma is to prove his mettle, he is ordinarily expected to keep up that spirit, as he in fact does on the ninth day, and not allow Arjuna to get the better of him once more, as happens on the third day. It is also somewhat odd that, on that third day, Arjuna should have been overcome by just a brief spell of lethargy, which is preceded as well as followed by continuous periods of very vigorous fighting.

The principal moments of the repeated incident are: (i) Bhīṣma's superior exploit third day (55. 3-39), ninth day (102. 1-29), (ii) Arjuna's lethargy (*mrduyuddhatā*): third day (55. 40-79), ninth day (102. 30-51), (iii) Kṛṣṇa's passionate onrush third day (55. 80-92), ninth day (102. 52-58); (iv) Bhīṣma's response, third day (55. 93-95), ninth day (102. 59-61), and (v) Arjuna's overtaking and persuading Kṛṣṇa to return, and resuming the fight, third day (55. 96-132), ninth day (102. 62-78). On a critical comparison of the corresponding portions of the text from the third and the ninth days of the battle, if we find one of the accounts more detailed and exaggerated and couched mostly in the Tristubh metre in place of the normal epic Anuṣṭubh, that account is likely to be late or secondary. This is so in the case of the description of the last three moments (iii-v) belonging to the third day. In view of this it would be quite safe to conclude that the repetition of the incident of Kṛṣṇa's rushing against Bhīṣma on the third day of the battle is secondary, being an afterthought primarily designed to give occasion for the sectarian *Viśvopākhyāna* being brought into the picture. Such a conclusion would also gain in probability by the added circumstance (which cannot escape being noticed by even a superficial reader) that the descriptions of the first two moments (i-ii) of the incident belonging to the above two days contain a very large number of verbally identical stanzas, lines

and phrases, which makes it impossible to suppose that the texts belonging to the two days in question could have been quite independent compositions.

It is in this substantially identical portion of the text that a very interesting problem relating to Mahābhārata text-transmission confronts us, which I propose to here very briefly indicate. I must say that the problem struck me as a problem only after the work of constituting the text of the two chapters in accordance with the established procedure in the matter had been completed.¹ That the problem would assume the form in which I am going to present it here was the least expected. In order that readers might exactly appreciate the situation, I present in the pages that follow the constituted text of chapter 55 of the Bhīsmaparvan, stanzas 34-66^{ab} and chapter 102, stanzas 24-52 in opposite columns, the portion common to the two chapters being given once only in the centre, while the variant readings are placed in the two side columns. Stars indicate that the lines are wanting in the description of the day concerned. For facility of reference I have numbered the entire text by lines 1 to 67.

¹ Thus for instance in line 1 द्यमानादि (55. 34^a) was accepted on the evidence of Ks-s B D (except D₂), while द्यमानाश्च (102. 24^a) on the evidence of Ś₁ K₀₋₂ 4 B M_{1-3, 5}.

In line 2 'प्रपौडिना (55. 34^d) was accepted on the evidence of Ś₁ K₀₋₃ 5 D₂ G_{1, 3} M, while 'प्रपौडिनान् (102. 24^d) on the evidence of all MSS, except D₁ T₂, Ś₁ K₀ 1 om.

In line 13 देवकिनन्दन (55. 40^b) was accepted on the evidence of Ś₁ K D_{2, 5}, while द्यावन्नन्दन (102. 30^b) is given by all MSS. without exception.

In line 30 रश्मिमान् (55. 47^d) was accepted on the evidence of Ś₁ Ks T₂₋₄ M₁₋₄, while रश्मिवान् (102. 38^d) on the evidence of Ś₁ K₀₋₄ B DaDn D₁ 3, 4 (orig) 5-8 T₂ G₁ M₄

In line 55 तौ भीष्मशरविश्वतौ (55. 60^b) was accepted on the evidence of Ś₁ K_{0, 4} B DaDn D_{2-5, 7}, while भीष्मपार्थौ शरश्वतौ (102. 49^b) on the evidence of Ś₁ K₁.

It will be noted that in all these places there was no other variant as strongly supported as the one accepted; several of the rejected readings were rejected by reason of some slight change or error, but otherwise they also support the accepted text.

Constituted Text of the Repeated Lines

[N B Insignificant variants are passed over without comment]

Variant Readings		Common Readings	Line	Variant Readings	
Third Day 6 55 34-60 ^{ab}	Third Day 6 102 24-52			Ninth Day 6 102 24-52	
यतमानापि ते वीरा द्रवमाणाम्महाराथात् ।	1	यतमानाश्च	
*प्रपीडिताः	नाशकबुवन्वारवितुं भीष्मबाण	महेन्द्रसमवीर्येण वध्यमाना महाचम् ।	2	*प्रपीडिताश्च	
	अभ्यस्त महाराज न च द्वौ मह धावत-	आविस्तरयनागार्थं पतितध्वजकूरम् ।	3		
	अनीकं पाण्डुपुत्राणां हाहाभूतमचेतनम् ।	जवानाश्च पिता पुत्रं पुत्रश्च पितरं तथा ।	4		
	प्रियं सखायं चाक्रन्दे सखा देवबलाकृत-	विमुच्य कवचानन्ये पाण्डुपुत्रस्य सैनिका ।	5		
	प्रकीर्य केशान्धावन्तः प्रत्यहदयन्त भारत ।	उग्रोक्तमिवोद्धान्तमुद्रान्तरथकुञ्जरम् ।	6		
	दहते पाण्डुपुत्रस्य सैन्यमातंसरं तदा ।	प्रभज्यमानं ^(a) दृष्ट्वा ^(b) नन्दन ।	7		
(a) तत्सैन्यं (b) देवकिं	उवाच पार्थ बीभत्सुं निर्गुण रथमुत्तमम् ।	अयं स कालः संप्राप्तः पार्थ यः काङ्क्षित-	8	(a) सैन्यं तु (b) यादव*	
	प्रहरासौ नरव्याघ्र न चेन्मोहा	^(a) कथितं वीर ^(b) राज्ञां समागमे ।	9	*स्त्व	
			10	*द्विमुखासे	
(a) यत्स्वया (b) पुरा			11	(a) यत्पुरा (b) त्वया	

Line	Variant Readings		Common Readings	Lane	Variant Readings	
	Third Day	6 55, 34-66 ^{ab}			Ninth Day	6 102 34-53
* 19	*	*	विराटनगरे पार्थ संजयस्य समीपत । भीष्मद्रोणयुधान्सर्वान्धारतराष्ट्रस्य सैनिकान् । सानुबन्धान्निव्यामि ये मां योत्सन्ति संयुगे । इति तत्कुरु कौन्तेय सत्यं वाक्यमस्मिदिम ।	18 19 20 21		
* 20						
* 21						
				Lane		
			वीभत्सो पश्य सैन्यं स्वं भज्यमानं समन्तत । द्रवतश्च महीपालान्सर्वान्चैधिष्ठिरे बले । दृष्ट्वा हि समरे भीष्मं व्यासाननमिवान्तकम् । भयार्तो संप्रणश्यन्ति सिंहं क्षुद्रशृगा इव । एवमुक्तः प्रत्युवाच वासुदेवं धर्मजयः ।	22 23 24 25 26	अश्वधर्ममुत्सृज्य युधामन्युः भरतर्षभ । इत्युक्तो वासुदेवेन त्रिपुटदृष्टिर्बोमुखः । अकाम इव बीमस्तुरिदं वचनमब्रवीत् । अवधानां वधं कृत्वा राज्यं वा नरकोत्तरम् । दुःखाति वनवासे वा किं नु मे सुकृतं भवेत् ।	
27	विगाहैतद्वलाणवस		चोदयामान्वतो भीष्म		27	करिष्ये वचनं तव ।
* 28	*	*	पातयिष्यामि दुर्धर्षं वृद्धं कुरुपितामहम् ।	28		
* 29	*	*	ततोऽद्यात्रजतप्रस्थ्याश्चोदयामास माधवः ।	29		
(a) 30	(b) 'रयो' (b) 'ओ रविममानिव		यतो भीष्म(°) .. राजन्दुष्ये(°) ..	30	(a) 'न्तो' (b) 'इयो रविममानिव	
31			ततस्त्युनरावृत्तं युधिष्ठिरबलं महत् ।	31		
32			दृष्ट्वा पार्थं महाबाहुं भीष्मायोधन्तमाहवे ।	32		
33			ततो भीष्मः कुरुब्रह्मः सिंहवद्विजदन्मुहुः ।	33		
34	तुर्ण		धर्मजयरथं शरवैरवाकिल ।	34	शीघ्रं	

Lane	Variant Readings Third Day : 6. 53, 34-66 ^{ab}	Common Readings	Lane	Variant Readings Ninth Day 6. 102 24-52
35	संछद्मो न प्रकाशते	क्षणेन स रयन्त्य सह्यः सहसराणि ।	35	
36	सखवान् ¹	शरवर्षेण सहता	36	न प्राज्ञायत किञ्चन
37		वासुदेवस्त्वस्रान्तो धैर्यमास्थाय	37	सात्वतः ¹
38		चोदयामास तान्वाञ्चिन्मन्मन्मन्मसायकैः	38	
39		ततः पार्थो धनुर्गृह्य दिव्यं जलदन्तिस्त्रिमम्	39	
40	त्रिभिः	पातयामास भीष्मस्य धनुर्भिस्त्रिणां शरैः ।	40	मिथैः
41		स चिच्छिन्नधन्वा कौरव्यः पुनरन्यन्महद्बलु ।	41	
42		निमेषान्तरमात्रेण मर्ज्यं चक्रं पिना तव ।	42	
43		विचक्रे ततो द्यौर्भ्यां धनुर्जलदन्तिस्त्रिमम् ।	43	
44		अथास्य तदपि कुण्डबिच्छेदं धनुर्गुणम् ।	44	
45		तस्य तत्पूजयामास लावणं शंतनो सुत ।	45	
46	भो पाण्डुनन्दन	साधु पार्थ महाबाहो माधु	46	कुन्तीसुतेति च
47		न्वत्येवैतद्युक्तरूपं महत्कर्म धनंजय ।	47	
48		प्रीतोऽस्मि सुदृढ पुत्र कुरु युद्धं मया सह ।	48	
50	वीरः ²	युमोच यमरे शरान्पार्थयं प्रति ।	50	भीष्मः ³

इति पार्थ प्रसास्याथ प्रगृह्णान्यन्महद्बलु ।

Lane 49

ममामाभ्यन्तमपरं प्रगृह्य रुचिरं धनुः ।

¹ *Sāttvatah* is a more tamhu equidiet, *sattvatah* is somewhat unusual

² *Vīrah* is less specific than *Bhīmah*.

Line	Variant Readings Third Day : 6 55 34-66 ^{ab}	Common Readings	Line	Variant Readings Ninth Day : 6 102, 24-52
51		अदर्शयद्वासुदेवो हययाते परं बलम् ।	51	
52	मण्डलान्यचरक्षु	मोघान्कुर्वन्शरानित्य	52	मण्डलानि विदर्शयन्
53		तथापि भीष्मः सुदृढं वासुदेवचनजयौ ।	53	*
54		विद्याच निमित्तैर्बाणैः सर्वगात्रेषु मारिच ।	54	*
55	तौ भीष्मशरविभक्तौ	शुशुभाले नरव्याघ्रौ	55	भीष्मपाथौ शरक्षतौ
56	नर्दन्तौ	गोवृषाविव	56	मंरुधौ
57		पुनश्चापि सुसंकुण्डः शरैः संनतपर्वभिः ।	57	*
58		कृष्णयोरुपि संरब्धो भीष्मो व्यावारयद्विश ।	58	*
59		वाणैर्व च शरैस्त्रीक्ष्णैः कल्पयामास रोषित ।	59	*
60		सुहृन्भुज्जम्भयन्भीष्मं ग्रहस्य स्वनवत्तदा ।	60	*
61		ततः कृष्णस्तु समरे दृष्ट्वा भीष्मपराक्रमम् ।	61	*
62	संप्रेक्ष्य च महाबाहुः ¹	पार्थस्य सुदुर्बुद्धताम् ।	62	वासुदेवस्तु संप्रेक्ष्य ¹
63		भीष्मं च शरवर्षाणि सृजन्तमनिशं युधि ।	63	
64		प्रपतन्त्वभिवादित्वं मत्प्रमासाद्य सेनयोः ।	64	
65		वरान्वरान्विभिन्नतं पाण्डुपुत्रस्य सैनिकाम् ।	65	
66		युगान्तमिव कुर्वाणं भीष्मं यौधिष्ठिरे बले ।	66	
67	असुख्यमाणो भगवान्केशवः	परवीरहा ।	67	नामृष्यत महाबाहुर्मोक्षकः

¹ The *ca* in line 62 refers to *śrīśā* in line 61. When line 61 was omitted, the *ca* had to be changed to *śa*.

Upon a careful comparison of the text as presented here, the following five points of critical importance would seem to emerge. (1) There are four cases, three of which are attempts to turn a *lectio difficilior* (belonging to the description of the third day) into a *lectio facilior* (belonging to the ninth day), and the fourth a phenomenon of case-attraction. This would mean that — so far as the present passage goes — it is the third-day description that is earlier and original, while it is the ninth-day description (which on other considerations and in other sections we found to be earlier and original) that we have to now put down as a modification from that of the third-day. The four cases are: (a) in line 1, the reading यत्तमानापि which contains an archaic double *sandhi*, while the reading यत्तमानाश्च removes that grammatical irregularity, (b) in line 2, the reading भीष्मबाण-प्रवीक्षिताः of the third day which gives the reason why the warriors were unable to stop the fugitive soldiers; the corresponding भीष्मबाणप्रवीक्षिताश्च (presumably caused by attraction to महारथान् above) adding nothing to the main statement नाशयन्तुवन्; (c) in line 13, the form देवकिनन्दनः (instead of the regular देवकीनन्दनः), which has to be explained away (like the proper name Kālidāsa) with the help of Pāṇini 6. 3. 63, whereas the corresponding याव-नन्दन has no grammatical irregularity to be explained away; (d) in line 30 the form रक्षिमाम् (in place of the more usual रक्षिमाश्च), which has to be explained, under Pāṇini 8. 2. 9, by subsuming the word रक्षि under the यवादिगण, which is an आकृतिगण or a list of words to which occasional additions in a case of need are permitted. Some persons may not be inclined to attach much importance to these small points of grammar, but the fact is undoubted that four instances all possessing the same tendency have been collected from a passage of just thirty stanzas.

Here is another feature (2) offered by the same passage. Lines 17-21 contain Kṛṣṇa's exhortation to Arjuna, in which the latter is reminded of certain boastful words formerly uttered by him, which he is now called upon to make good. Line 18 of this passage is extra in the ninth-day text, and its purpose obviously is to more narrowly specify the occasion of Arjuna's earlier speech. Arjuna, it would seem, had boasted of his ability to kill Bhīṣma and others not only in Upaplavya (a suburb of the Virāṭa

capital) in the presence of Samjaya (5. 47. 46 ff.), but also in his return-message to Duryodhana conveyed through Duryodhana's messenger Ulūka, who met the Pāṇḍavas in their army-camp at Kuruksetra (cf. 5. 158-160). As can be easily seen, it is in the nature of a later text to more narrowly specify an earlier dubious reference.

In the next place (3), when warriors fought, it was quite in the order of the day that they should wound (and even kill) each other's horses and charioteers. Accordingly, Bhīṣma could legitimately wound Kṛṣṇa the charioteer of Arjuna, as well as Arjuna himself. Lines 53-61 in the account of the third day describe how this happened. In the account of the ninth day, lines 53-54 and 57-61 are altogether absent, and, what is more noteworthy, the pronoun *ते* ('those two') which in line 55 (as found in the third day's account) stands obviously for Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna, is, in the ninth day's description, dropped, and Bhīṣma and Arjuna are specifically mentioned. Obviously, the author of the ninth day's description did not wish to unnecessarily emphasise Bhīṣma's having wounded the Divine charioteer of Arjuna. Such a sentiment belongs to a later age.

Further (4), we have already seen that on the ninth or the penultimate day of his Generalship, Bhīṣma all along retains his hold upon Arjuna in the fight. Such words as those in lines 47 and 48, or the description in lines 57-61 should accordingly fit in on the penultimate day, and not on a day like the third when Bhīṣma is unable to offer to the end an effective resistance to Arjuna. Actually, however, the words are found in the account of the third day (as though that was the real penultimate day of Bhīṣma's fight), and not in the account of the ninth day. If they were there originally in both the accounts, it is difficult to explain their omission from a context where they fitted better, and their retention in a context where they did not fit, unless we suppose that the context where they now are was at one time the context in which they did actually fit; that day, in other words, being, *in an earlier stage of the Epic*, the penultimate day of Bhīṣma's Generalship. That the present eighteen-day battle is frightfully padded by reduplications, exaggerations, and inventions of the miraculous is generally conceded, so that a saving of six days this way

would be quite welcome, though it might be naturally very difficult to prove it now by adequate objective evidence.

Finally (5), compare and contrast carefully the text of lines 22-27 as they appear in the third day's account and in that of the ninth. The words as we find them in the earlier account fit in there quite well, and they could just as well have fitted, in the same form, in the later or the ninth day's account. But there has been a change, which could only have been from the third day to the ninth, and not vice versa. The change could only have been motivated by the desire to explain how it was that, in spite of the great and unforgettable teaching of the *Bhagavad-gītā* revealed on the first day of the battle, Arjuna could still be invaded by the old scruples and exhibit no interest or vigour in the fight. So an attempt seems to have been made, in the account of the ninth day, to show that, although the old scruples continued still to bother Arjuna, he eventually did pull himself up and repeat in exactly the same words¹ the promise — *kariṣye vacanam tava* — that he had made in BG. 18 73⁴.

The question naturally suggests itself why was not the *Gītā motif* also introduced on the third day? It cannot be seriously maintained that the *Gītā* teaching was fresher on the third day than on the ninth. If the great teaching could at all be forgotten on the ninth day, it could just as well have been forgotten on the third. Further, if the *Gītā* teaching needed a reminder, we expect the reminder to be administered on the day that is to be followed by Arjuna's accordant action thereafter, so that there might be no need later of a reminder to the reminder, as would have been the case if the *Gītā motif* had also been introduced on the third day. There may also be this other explanation possible. The author of the later remodelling of lines 22-27 on the ninth day was greatly obsessed by the importance of the BG. teaching, which, in that more primitive stage in the development of the Epic when the third day of Bhīṣma's Generalship was the penultimate day, might not yet have attained to its subsequent pre-eminence. That the present *Bhagavadgītā*, like the present

¹ The line 28 (which is extra in the ninth day) only specifies what the Lord's *vacanam* was which Arjuna was going to follow.

Mahābhārata, had at least one (if not two) earlier less developed forms is generally conceded, although real differences begin the moment one proceeds to say what the earlier and the earliest forms of the Poem were like.

The Mahābhārata itself is our authority for the view that, before the Epic assumed its present form and dimension of approximately one lac of stanzas, it was a smaller poem of about 24,000 stanzas devoted to an account of the origin and history of the Bhārata clan, culminating in the great fratricidal war, but not yet containing the several subsidiary stories or *upākhyānas* ; and that in its earliest form the Poem was limited to a descriptive account of the Victory or Jaya in the war, and need not therefore have extended beyond eight or ten thousand stanzas. Nor need we suppose that the transition from the Jaya to the Bhārata and again from the Bhārata to the Mahābhārata stages, was made all at one stroke and without intervening sub-stages. It is as though a coat originally made to fit a youth of small stature came in time to be enlarged by the opening out of certain seams and the occasional addition of cloth-pieces here and there to fit the body of an oversize adult, until someone thought once again of remodelling and substantially altering its entire cut and size and fashioning a loose overcoat out of it, — care being taken all along this triple process of sartorial evolution that no bits of the old cloth were absolutely thrown away as waste. In the final product of the tailoring art—however commendable the skill-of the sempsters — it was inevitable that, once in a while, the seams, holes, creases and other vestiges of the earlier stages of the coat obtruded themselves here and there. Some of these, as for instance the reduplication of the *Kṛṣṇa-pratynū-bhaṅga* incident with the express purpose of engrafting the *Viśvopākhyāna* on the main story, are plainly discernible. Others, however, are more subtle and elusive, as when in the body of an added passage (e. g. the account of the third day of the battle), which shows the usual signs of lateness, a fragment is discovered (e. g. the 67 lines above given) showing evident marks of an earlier stage. Until all such cases that might present themselves throughout the whole Epic are carefully garnered and tabulated, it would be hazardous to definitely say to what stage a given fragment

belongs and what the specific form of the Poem then was of which it constituted an integral part. The Critical Edition of the *Mahābhārata* is doing in its own way, slowly and diligently, the above-mentioned work of garnering and tabulating. The time for estimating the value of the completed work is not yet. What this paper is meant to offer in the meanwhile is just a fleeting glimpse of the possibilities that can be eventually opened out, so that, in the fulness of time, we might be able to trace some of the earlier stages in the evolution of the Great Epic of India, and, as the Great Epic at all its stages generally has been a reflex of the cultural life of India, we would thereby be able to obtain a living record of the historical evolution, through the centuries, of the ideas and ideals of the peoples of Bhāratavarsa.

Finally, it would be interesting in this context to discuss the question as to whether, in rushing upon Bhīṣma in anger, Kṛṣṇa did commit any breach of undertaking. So far as the account of the third day is concerned, the breach of plighted word is without cavil, as there Kṛṣṇa has the *Sudarśana* in his hand (55.86-93). But in the ninth-day account, which we have reason to believe was—barring the 67 lines—the original and only account of the incident once, Kṛṣṇa leaps down with the charioteer's whip in hand (*pratodapāṇi*), having the arm as the only weapon of attack (*bhujaprabharaṇaḥ*) · cf. 102.53-54. Kṛṣṇa was no doubt irritated; but in rushing upon Bhīṣma the way he does on the ninth day, Kṛṣṇa might have intended to convey to Bhīṣma the lesson that the cause for which Bhīṣma had taken the vow of lifelong celibacy would be much better served by his dying now the warrior's death on the battlefield. Bhīṣma was, in fact, already a hundred years old. The royal line of his step-brother Vicitravīrya whose interest he had vowed to protect, had produced sons (Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Pāṇḍu) and grandsons (Duryodhana and his 99 brothers, and the five Pāṇḍavas), who were then trying out their differences on the battlefield of Kurukṣetra. Bhīṣma is inwardly convinced that the Pāṇḍavas had the right on their side. All his pleadings in the case remained unheeded. He also knew that Duryodhana, on whose side he had to fight as a matter of Kṣatriya etiquette, cared very little for his help and had openly insulted him by suggesting that he might resign in favour of Karna. Was there any sense now in Bhīṣma's wishing to live

yet a few years more? The right Āryan way ever had been to march boldly forth to meet death halfway, when all the good that you could do living had been already achieved. This in fact was the point of view that, in their overnight conference on the ninth day, Kṛṣṇa and the Pāṇḍavas must have placed before Bhīṣma; and Kṛṣṇa's marching weaponless against Bhīṣma on the battle-field can be interpreted as a graphic prelude to that admonition. Eventually we know from the Epic itself that Bhīṣma does come round to this view : cf. 6. 103. 66; 11. 12-15, 115. 31-40. The author responsible for the duplication of the incident on the third day misunderstands the real purpose of Kṛṣṇa's march, and gives the Sudarśana in his hand, and the circumstance that Kṛṣṇa would be thereby breaking his promise is explained in some still later accounts by the pretty story that, while Kṛṣṇa had vowed not to wield any weapon during the Kaurava-Pāṇḍava war, Bhīṣma on his own part had staked his own position as a devotee of Kṛṣṇa upon his ability to make the latter break his vow; and, as is usual in a tussle between the God and his devotee, the latter wins.

SAMUDRA GUPTA'S CONQUEST OF KOTTŪRA

BY

B. A. SALETORÉ

In this paper I propose to identify one of the conquests of Samudra Gupta mentioned in his famous Allahabad Pillar Inscription. This important record contains the following passage—

" Whose (i. e. Samudra Gupta's) great good fortune was mixed with, so as to be increased by (his) glory produced by the favour shewn in capturing and then liberating Mahendra of Kośala, Vyāghrarāja of Mahākāntāra, Mantarāja of Kerala (Karāla) Mahendra of Pistapura, Svāmidatta of Kottūra on the hill, Damana of Erandapalla Viśnugopa of Kāñci (and other monarchs mentioned with their capitals). " ¹

The above conquests refer to what are called the Dakṣiṇapatha conquests of Samudra Gupta. I shall confine myself to the fifth conquest mentioned in the above list, viz., " Svāmidatta of Kottūra on the hill " as given by Fleet. He identified Kottūra with either Kailāsa Kotta (Lat. 19° 14' N, Long 83° 36 E) or with Kottūr in the Coimbatore district (Lat. 10° 32' N ; Long. 73° 2 E) ² Smith conjectured thus—" Kottūra may be identified with the Pollachi sub-division of the Coimbatore district of the Madras Presidency. The beryl mines of Padiyur, which were famous in the Roman world at the beginning of the Christian era, were probably included within the limits of the kingdom." ³

¹ Fleet, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Gupta Inscriptions*, pp 12-14.

² *Ibid*, p 7, n(3) Fleet wrote thus about the conquests - " The statement that Samudra Gupta conquered the above mentioned kings, need not be added literary, especially as it seems almost certain that the Gupta dominions were bounded on the south by the Narmadā. Nor need we even take it as a fact that he invaded their dominions " (Fleet, *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, p. 280). Why Fleet should have been so sceptical about Samudra Gupta's conquests, one fails to understand ! The reason given by him, viz., that because Samudra Gupta's Empire was bounded on the south by the Narmadā, he could not have conquered the places to the south of that river, is altogether unintelligible. But in his *Gupta Inscription* Fleet rectifies some of his earlier errors.

³ Vincent Smith, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1897*, p. 29.

Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar denies the identification of Smith without himself giving us any definite clue. He writes thus—"Kotturu or Kottura may be one of the several places of name in the same region (*i. e.*, Pistapuram) without going so far as Coimbatore to find a place answering to the name".¹ Jayaswal merely said that Kottura may be one of the two districts in Gānjam with a hill fortress, the other being Mahendragiri.²

The identification of Kottura mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription with either Kailāsa Kotta or with Kottura in the Coimbatore district or with Pollachi in the same district, as proposed by Fleet and Smith, cannot be accepted for the following reasons: (a) The Coimbatore district is too far removed from the entire region mentioned in the inscription, namely the Pistapura-Erandapalle-Kāñci sector. If Samudra Gupta had really gone as far as the Coimbatore district, which lies to the south of Mysore, there would have been some reference in the inscription to any of the principalities that lay between Kāñci and Coimbatore. Since there is no reference of this kind, it is evident that the Gupta conqueror did not go as far as Coimbatore to the south. (b) To have attracted the attention of that great warrior, Kottura must have been a place of prominence either as a military stronghold or as the capital of a kingdom. There is no evidence that either Kailāsa Kotta or Kotturu or Pollachi in the Coimbatore district was ever a place of any importance in any period of Indian history.

Hence we have to turn elsewhere in order to identify the hill-fortress of Kottura mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription. I must confess that both Fleet and Smith were correct when they assumed that it ought to be somewhere in Karnāṭaka. For the name is Kannada. In fact, there are at least three Kotturus in Karnāṭaka with which one may be tempted to

¹ S. K. Ayyangar, *Studies in Gupta History*, p. 27.

² Jayaswal, *History of India*, p. 137. Dr. D. C. Sirkar conjectures thus that the state mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar inscription, which "may be conjecturally assigned to the Kālīṅga region," are Kurāṭa, Koṭṭura, Piṣṭapura, Erandapalle, Avamukta and Devaṛāṣṭra. (Sirkar, *Successors of the Śātavāhanas in Eastern Deccan*, p. 67). Dr. Sirkar's conjectures are no better than those of Drs. Ayyangar and Jayaswal.

16 [*Annals*, B. O. B. I.]

identify the Kottūra mentioned above. There is Kottūru in Bairakūru *hobli* in the Kolar district of the Mysore State: another Kottūru in the Tondebhāvi *hobli* also in the Kolar district, and a third Kottūru in the Cintāmani *hobli* also in the same district. I am not inclined to identify the Kottūra mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription with any of these three places in the Kolar district, because they do not seem to have been at any time either capitals of kingdoms or military strongholds. The epigraphs discovered in these places merely show that they were ordinary localities of average importance. Thus in Kottūru in the Bairakūru *hobli*, a stone inscription recording an ordinary gift of paddy by an official called the Illustrious Mallana to a citizen named Virappa has been found.¹ At Kottūru in the Tondebhāvi *hobli* a damaged inscription records the gift of land by a high Vijayanagara official called Kōnappaya Deva Mahārāya, the Governor of Penugonda, to the temple of the gods Tiruvengalanātha and Aubalesvara in A. D. 1546, during the reign of the Emperor Sadāsiva Rāya.² At Kottūru in the Cintāmani *hobli*, has been found a stone inscription dated only on the 30th lunar day of the dark half of Kārttika of the cyclic year Kālāyukta (and hence not verifiable), but of the reign of the Vijayanagara Emperor Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya the Great, registering the gift of land below the tank in the village of Kottūru (*Kottūru kereya kelage*) for the services of the god Tiruvengalanātha of Ālembādi, by Kāmappa Nāyaka under orders from the Mahāmandalesvara Virappa Odeyar.³ In none of these records is there any evidence to show that the Kottūrus in the Kolar district were of any military or political importance.⁴

¹ *Mysore Archaeological Report for 1923*, p. 65.

² *Ibid for 1925*, p. 75.

³ *Ibid for 1928*, pp. 73-74.

⁴ There are other Kottūras in the Tamil land. For example, there is Kottūru in Nenmalaināḍu, a sub-division of Rajendracolavalanāḍu, now in the Tanjore district, Madras Presidency. An incomplete record of the Cola king Rājādhirāja III mentions a gift of land in that village to the local deity (Bangacharya, *A Topographical List of Inscriptions in the Madras Presidency* II, Tj. 480, p. 1291). This place contains many records none of which refer to any fort. They are entirely benedictory epigraphs dated in the twelfth century A. D., relating to the local temple of Koluṇḍi-

(continued on the next page)

But this is not the case with another place of the same name with which I identify the Kottūra mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription. This is Kottūra in the Kudligi taluka, Bellary district, Madras Presidency, which satisfies the three essential conditions necessary for its identification with Kottūra of the Allahabad Pillar Inscriptions, viz., that it was in Karnātaka, that it was near to the Kāñci-Pistapuram-Erandapalle sector, and that it was the capital of a kingdom with traditions of greatness extending over at least six centuries. It is called Kottūru in some records and Kottūra in others. In fact, so late as the sixteenth century, as will be seen in the course of this paper, while examining the Vijayanagara records, it is called consistently Kottura exactly as in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription.

It must be admitted that for the present we are in the dark as to the history of Kottūra for some ages immediately after the age of Samudra Gupta. But in the eleventh century it figures as one of the conquests of a well-known Cola monarch. I refer to the famous Tamil king Rājendra Cola II, also called Kulottunga Cola I, who ruled from A. D. 1070 till about 1118.¹ In a fragmentary stone inscription found in the Durgā temple at Agara, Yelandur taluka, Mysore State, and bearing two regnal dates (the 12th and the 34th years) of the king's reign, corresponding to A. D. 1081 and 1103 respectively, we have the following information that the king, when still a *yuvārāja*,

(continued from the previous page)

śvara (Rangacharya, *ibid.*, Tj. 480-502, pp 1291-1294). There is another Kottūru in the Chinglepat District, where records of the Cola King Kulottunga III, referring to a former gift by a Sambhuvārāja to the local deity at Kottūru, have been found (Rangacharya, *ibid.*, I Cg. 380, p. 367). In a record dated in the 5th year of the Cola King Rājendradeva (A. D. 1052-1063), it is called Colavidyādhara caturvedimangalam (Rangacharya, Cg. 1152, p. 462). Another Kottūru is located in the Ambaranādu, a subdivision of Colamaṇḍala, in a record of the Cola King Virarājendra Coladeva. (Rangacharya, *ibid.*, Cg. 1153, p. 63). A still another Kottūru is mentioned in a record of King Rājādhirāja II (Rangacharya, *ibid.*, Ct. 337, p. 517). For a Kottūru in the Kistna District, as mentioned in a record dated A. D. 1576-7, see Rangacharya, *ibid.*, II, Kt. 702A, p. 885. In the Pudukottai State there is another Kottūru which is mentioned in a record of Kulottunga Cola Deva I (Rangacharya, *ibid.* III, Pd 41, p. 1626). And for another Kottūru in the Travancore State, see *ibid.*, III, p. 1696.

¹ Blox, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 84.

wedded for the first time to the brilliant goddess of victory by his heroic deeds at Sakkaragottam (Okrakottam in the Bastar State in Central India), captured troops of elephants at Vairagaram. that, having spurred his war-steed, he unsheathed his sword and displayed the strength of his arms, and put to flight the army of the kings of Kontala (Kuntala), who were armed with sharp lances, and put on the garland of victory over the Northern region (here follow his other conquests): that he was pleased to take possession of the pearl fisheries, the Podiyal mountain where the three forms of Tamil flourished, the middle Sayyim (Sahya) where the furious rutting elephants were captured and Kanni, and to establish settlements of people on all sides (in the conquered country) including Kottāru, so that all the heroes of the western hill-country ascended to high heaven while the Kungalars (the Kongas of Konganād) became scattered, etc.¹

In the above list, although Kottāru is mentioned after the pearl fisheries of the south and after the Podiyal mountain, yet it is essentially located in the western Sahya region which is precisely the geographical position in which we find Kottūra in the Bellary district. The fact that it is mentioned as one of the conquests of king Rājendra Cola II shows that in the first half of the eleventh century, Kottūra was an important military centre.

That in addition it was also an important cultural centre is proved by a stone inscription found in front of the ruined Kalle-svara temple at Kottūra itself. It is dated in the Čalukya-Vikrama era 36, Nandana, Vaiśākha, śu. 3, Brhaspati, and Uttarāyana, corresponding probably to A. D. 1112, April, 1 Monday, the week-day not corresponding. It refers to the reign of Western Čalukyan monarch Tribhuvanamalla, who is identified with Vikramāditya VI, and who ruled from A. D. 1076 till 1126.² It mentions the Mahāmandaleśvara Tribhuvanamalla Pāṇḍyadeva as ruling over Nonabavādi (Nolambavādi) 32,000, and the Mahāmandaleśvara Ghattiayarasa of the Kadamba family as ruling over the Kōgaḷi 500 Province. The latter official made a gift of

¹ *Mysore Archaeological Report for 1917*, pp. 42-43; Rice, *Mysore & Coorg*, p. 93.

² Rice, *ibid.*, p. 73.

land (specified), after washing the feet of the teacher Amṛtarāśi Panditadeva, for the services of the god Rāmeśvara of Kottūra and for feeding the ascetics. The epithet used in connection with Kottūra is noteworthy :— it is called *śrī* (the illustrious,) (and) original Kottūra (*śrī Kottūra mūlasthānam*). The donor, I may add, has a string of titles, one of which is the following *Ucchangi-dev-labdhā-vara-prasādam* (He who had secured the boon from the goddess [of] Uchangi).¹

We have now to show that *Kottūra* was the capital of a province. This is proved by a stone inscription found in the Pampāpati svāmi temple at Bennehalli, Harapanahalli taluka, in the same Bellary district. The date of the record is irregular, but it refers to A. D. 1148, April the 20th, Tuesday, the week-day Monday as well as the Solar eclipse and the Uttarāyana-samkrānti given in the record not corresponding. The monarch mentioned in it is the Western Cālukya Jagadekamalladeva (II), whose other name was Permma, and who ruled from A. D. 1138 till 1150.² His Mahāmandalesvara Jagadekamalladeva Vira Pāṇḍyadeva was ruling over the Nolambavādi 32,000 Province from his capital of Uchangi. He granted the village of Bennaganūru (location given) to the Mahāpradāna Vatsarāja to be granted to the temple of the god Svayambhūdeva of the village. We are informed that at this time king Nācīdeva of the Kadamba family ruled over the Kottūru 12 and the Kogali 500 Provinces from his capital of Kottūru (*intu negerittegum pogaritegum tane Janmabhūm yamb-i-Kottūr-panneraḍuman Kogali-aiṇūruman*).³ Here was, therefore, Kottūra the capital of the two Provinces of Kottūru 12 and Kogali 500, and the " Homeland of Fame and Renown, " in the middle of the twelfth century. We may note incidentally that the larger division called Kogali 500 included within itself the smaller division called Kottūru 12.

In order to find out the truth of the above eulogy given to Kottūru as the " Homeland of Fame and Renown, " we have to

¹ *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol. IX, P. I. No. 187 pp 181-182, 319 of 1895.

² *Rice Mysore and Coorg*, p. 73.

³ *S. I. I.*, IX, P. I., No. 251, pp. 260-262. The Kogali 500 Province is now represented by the Harapanahalli and Hūvinahadagalli talukas of the Bellary, District. Rangacharya, *op. cit.*, I, p. 294.

ascertain as to when the larger political division called Kōgali 500 came into existence. In other words, we have to find out the antiquity of the Kōgali 500 Province itself. This Province may be dated, as will be shown later on in this paper, to at least the fifth century A. D. But from the ninth century onwards it figures prominently in epigraphs. Thus a stone inscription found in front of the Venkatesādeva temple at Mēvundi, Mundaragi Petha, Dharwar district, and dated Śāka 818, Nāla Kārttika, Śu. 5 Monday corresponding to A. D. 897, October the 3rd Monday, mentions the Rāstrakūta monarch Akalavarasa, Kṛṣṇa II, who ruled from A. D. 939 till 968.¹ Under him was a Mahāsāmanta, whose name is lost, but who belonged to the Yādava dynasty, and who was placed over the Kōgali 500 and the Māseyyavādi 140 Provinces. He constructed a temple of Keyage-svara at Melividu which is called a capital (*rājadhāni*).² This high official was no other than the Mahāsāmanta Kuppayarasa, who really held charge of the Puligere 300 Province in addition to the two divisions mentioned above.³ Governor Śobhanarasa also possessed Kōgali under him, in addition to Banavāsi 600, Belvoja 300, Purigere 300, Kundūru 500, and Kukkanūru 30 Provinces, in the tenth century.⁴

The Kōgali 500 division passed under the Mahāsāmanta Bijja, who governed it under the Rāstrakūta king Nityavarasa Indra Ballaha III in Śāka 844, Citrabhānu, Bhādrapada Tuesday, full moon, which corresponds but for the week-day, which happens to be Monday, to A. D. 922, September the 9th.⁵ It is obviously the same Mahāsāmanta with the title of *Birudara Rotta*, who is said to be ruling over the Kōgali 500 division under the same monarch, in an undated record found close to the Kallesvara temple at Bāgali, Harapanahalli taluka, Bellary district.⁶ Kōgali

¹ Rice. *Op. Cit.*, p. 87.

² *S. I. I.* IX, P. I., No. 22, p. 13.

³ Krishnamachariu, *S. I. I.* IX, P. I. Intr. p. v. For another copy of the same record in characters of the twelfth century A. D., see *ibid.* No. 30, p. 17.

⁴ *Epigraphia Indica* IV, pp. 206-300. *S. I. I.* IX, P. I. Intr. p. viii.

⁵ *S. I. I.* *ibid.* No. 57, p. 32. See also No. 58, page *ibid.*

⁶ *S. I. I.* *ibid.* No. 59, p. 33.

500 is called Kōgaḷinādu in Śaka 853 (A. D. 931-2) under the official Ayyapayya, in the reign of the Rāstrakūta king Govinda IV.¹ In A. D. 956 it was governed by the Mahāsāmanta Rottayya, under the Rāstrakūta king Akālavarsa Kannara (Kṛṣṇa III).²

Kōgaḷi 500 remained in tact in the age of the Western Čalukyas of Kalyāṇi, who had overthrown the Rāstrakūtas in A. D. 973. It was governed in A. D. 987 along with Kisukādu 70 by the Mahāsāmanta Ayatavarmā, in the reign of the Western Čalukya monarch Āhavamalla, Tailapa Nūrmadi.³ The Mahāsāmanta's real name was Ādityavarmā, and he continued to be the governor of Kōgaḷi 500 till A. D. 993. We may mention that in that year he had under him also Saundatti 12.⁴

The notices of Kōgaḷi in the epigraphs of the eleventh century are more conspicuous. In the reign of the Western Čalukyan monarch Jagadekamalla, Jayasimha II, Kōgaḷi 500, along with a number of other divisions, was placed under his feudatory Udayādityarasa in A. D. 1018.⁵ It continued to be under the same feudatory till A. D. 1032, when his second son Pallava Permmādi was made its governor.⁶ From A. D. 1032, till 1048 Pallava Parmmādi governed the Kōgaḷi 500 division first under the monarch Jayasimha II, and then under the latter's successor Someśvara I.⁷ One of the records dated A. D. 1045 indicates the religious importance of the province. We are informed in this record that there was a prominent Kāśmukha *matha* called *Simhapariṣe* at Kōgaḷi for the maintenance of which an official called Ghattiyarasa made a specified gift of land.⁸

Under the same monarch Someśvara I we find in A. D. 1050 the feudatory Narasingadeva of the Pallava family as governor of Kōgaḷi 500.⁹ In A. D. 1054 it was still under Narasingadeva,

¹ *S. I. I., IX, P. I., No. 61, p. 34.* ² *Ibid.*, No. 66, p. 38. ³ *Ibid.*, No. 75, p. 46.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 76, 77, pp. 46-47. ⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 80, p. 50.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Nos. 85, 87, 90, 94, 96, pp. 56-58.

⁷ *Ibid.*, I, Nos. 85, 87, 88, 89, pp. 56-60 *Epigraphia Carnatica*, XI, Dg. 126, p. 74. *S. I. I. ibid.*, No. 94, p. 64, No. 99, p. 69, No. 101, p. 70, No. 104, pp. 78-79; *Ep. Car.* XI, Dg. 19, p. 29, *Ep. Car.* VII, He., 107, p. 77.

⁸ *S. I. I., ibid.*, No. 101, op. cit. For the religious (i. e., Lingayat and Jain) importance of Kōṭṭūra, and, therefore, of Kōgaḷi, read Bellary Gazetteer, I, pp. 290-291.

⁹ *S. I. I., ibid.*, No. 107, p. 82.

whose son Kumāra Corayadeva was governing the Uchchangi 30 division.¹ That Kōgali was also a Jaina centre is proved by a record dated Śaka 977 (A. D. 1055) of the same monarch Someśvara I. This epigraph is doubly interesting. Firstly, because it informs us that in Kōgali there was a Jaina temple (*basadi*) which imparted education, and that the Jaina teacher Indrakirti made a specified gift of land in Ittage, a suburb of Kōgali, for imparting education at the *basadi*. Secondly, we are told that that *basadi* at Kōgali had been formerly constructed by the king Durvinṭa (*idu Durvinṭanindam modalōl basadi nāḍamattara ghaḷeyam uḍṭayās-Indrakirttigalu-uḍṭoditam ūge māḍidar-Kōgaliyol*).² Since the king Durvinṭa mentioned in this record could have been no other than the well-known Ganga king of that name, about whose patronage to Jainism I have given ample proof elsewhere, and since he lived in the fifth century A. D.,³ we are to assume that Kōgali, and therefore, its capital Kottūru, were already prominent in the fifth century A. D. This brings us to within one century from the age of the Emperor Samudra Gupta.

The political and religious importance of Kōgali is further proved by a record dated A. D. 1062, when the same monarch Someśvara I was ruling. But the feudatory over Kōgali 500 was now Viṣṇuvardhana Mahārāja, who governed the entire Nolambavādi 32,000 Province. The mutilated record that gives us this detail also tells us that on that date, all the ministers and the *mahāprabhus* of Kōgalinād and the Kadambaligenād (*śrīmat-arasara-samasta-pradhānur-Kōgalinād...vundabaligenād-prabha...*), and with a number of leading Jaina and Brahman citizens, farmers of the five *mathasthānas*, the 96,000 (Province) Representatives, made a grant of land to the Ūrodeya (Collector of the District) Māranayya.⁴

¹ *Ep. Car.*, XI. JI. 10, p. 85.

² *S. I. I. ibid.*, No. 117, p. 92. ³ Salatore, *Medieval Jainism*, pp. 19-23

⁴ *E. Car.* XI, Dg. 143, pp. 77-78. Kōgali 500 figures in another mutilated record dated A. D. 1058 under a feudatory called Ganga Perumṣḍi Brahmadevarāja, who was evidently no other than Vinayāditya mentioned above. *Ibid.*, Dg. 153, pp. 79-80.

The undated Kōgali *basadi* record of the reign of the king Trailokyamalladeva is evidently to be assigned to this age; but I cannot make out how the editor of this epigraph came to write about the *nakharas* (citizens) of Kōgali.¹ This division continued to be under Visnuvardhana Mahārāja Vijayāditya in A. D. 1065² This feudatory, who is called the Lord of Vengi, was governor of Kōgali in A. D. 1066.³

In A. D. 1068 in the reign of the next Western Cālukyan monarch Someśvara II, Bhuvanaikamalla, the governor placed over Kōgali 500 was the Nolamba Pallava Jayasingadeva.⁴ Three years later in the reign of king Someśvara's famous brother Vikramāditya VI, Tribhuvanamalladeva, this monarch made a gift of the village of Kotiganūru in Kōgali 500 for the services of the god Kalideva, and for the Kālāmukha ascetics in the *matha* of Lakulesvara Pandita of Pūvina-Padangale. This record is interesting because it gives the geographical location of Kōgali 500 thus—*Tungabhadra-nadiya tenkana Kōgali-aināra-bahya*.⁵ This fact that Kōgali 500 was on the southern side of the Tungabhadra confirms my statement that that division, with its capital Kottūra, was essentially within the limits of Karnāṭaka.

We may pause here before proceeding further with the history of Kōgali 500 and its capital Kottūra, in order to understand the reference to the latter place in one of the inscriptions of the great Tamil monarch Rajendra Cola II. It is precisely because Kōgali lay on the southern side of the Tungabhadra, and to the north of the Tamil country, that its capital Kottūra is said to be in the record dated A. D. 1070 already cited above, as having been in the Western hilly country. Further, it is because of its political, religious, and cultural importance that, as related above, it is styled in A. D. 1148 as the "Homeland of Fame and Renown".⁶

¹ *I I IX*, No. 130, pp. 112-113

² *Ibid.*, No. 128, pp. 109-10.

Ibid., No. 129, pp. 111-112.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 132, p. 114.

Ibid., No. 135, pp. 118-119, ll. 9-10

⁶ I am inclined to believe that quite a number of places in the Tamil country mentioned in an earlier context in this paper, came to be called Kōttūru after the capture of the famous capital of Kōgali 500 by the well-known Tamil monarch Rajendra Cola II.

The importance of Kōgali 500 is further proved by another record dated A. D. 1108. This is however a very much damaged inscription. From it we gather that in the reign of the same Western Cālukya monarch Vikramāditya Tribhuvanamalladeva, the great minister, bearing the burden of whole kingdom, possessed of the three forms of government, the Pērggade Rācamayya Nāyaka held the office of Pērggade of the Kōgali 500 and the Kadambalige 1,000 Provinces¹

We lose sight of Kōgali for about forty years, but in A. D. 1148-9 in the reign of the Western Cālukyan monarch Jagadekamalla II, Permīma, as related above, when the feudatory Jagadekamalla Vira Pāndyadeva was governing the Nolambavādi 32,000 Province, from Uchchangī, the Kadamba lord Nācīdeva ruled over the Kottūru 12 and the Kōgali 500 divisions from the capital of Kottūru.² But in the reign of the same monarch, the same feudatory governed the Nolambavādi 32,000 Province from the capital of Uchchangī. The mutilated record dated A. D. 1150 which gives us this information, contains further proof that Kōgali, and, therefore, Kottūru, was within the limits of Karnāṭaka. For it informs us that to the face of Lady Wealth of Kuntala, Kōgali was the forehead mark (*śrīmat-Kuntalavenbud-onduvilasat-Lakṣmīkaram Kōgali-nāḍ-adarkke tūlakam*).³ Since Kuntala, as is well-known, was always within the boundaries of Karnāṭaka, and sometimes identical with it, we may reasonably assume that the scribe of the above record meant by Kuntala no other land but Karnāṭaka

That Kottūru was undoubtedly the capital of Kōgali 500 and of Kottūr 12 divisions, is proved by a record wrongly dated in Śaka 1085 (which is evidently an error for 1075) (A. D. 1154, January the 16th Friday, the week-day not corresponding), which informs us that Nācīdevaśara of the Kadamba family governed the Kōgali 500 and the Kottūru 12 divisions from his capital of Kottūra (*Nācī-dēvarasaru Kōgaliya-aṁūrūmam Kotūruppanneraḍūmam duṣṭa-nighraha-tīstha-pratīpalānadind-āldu Kotū-*

¹ *Ep. Car.* XI, J), 12, pp. 85-86

² *S. I. I.* IX, No. 250, pp. 260-2, *op. cit.*

³ *S. I. I.* ibid., No. 257, pp. 273-273.

ralu-sukha-sunkathā-vinodadim - rūjyam - gēyuttam - ire).¹ This Kadamba scion was evidently the same official we saw above under the monarch Jagadekamalla II. Nācideva is mentioned as the grand-father of the Mahāmandalesvara Vira Jagadala Bammidevarasa, who is represented as governing over the same region in A. D. 1212, evidently in the reign of the Hoysala ruler Ballāla II, although the latter is not mentioned in the epigraph. For our purpose we may note that the feudatory Nācideva is spoken of as having hailed from Kottūru itself (*Mahāmandalesvaram Kottūru Nācidevarasam*).² The high praise given to Kōgali 500 in the next year A. D. 1213 confirms my statement that that division was a part of Karnātaka. In this damaged record we have the following—That to the country Kuntala Kōgali was a mirror, and to the Pāndyadeśa a shining head jewel (*Kuntala-dēśakke-idu kannāḍi..... Pāṇḍya-viśayamam sogayipudu.. ant-eseva-Pāṇḍya-viśayakke-int-idu ramani mukuram-āgi Kōgaḷya-aṇṇūrumam*).³

We traverse almost half a century before we come across the next reference to Kōgali and Kottūru. By this time this part of Karnātaka had passed under the suzerainty of the Yādavas of Devagiri. In A. D. 1276 during the reign of the Yādava king Rāmacandradeva, the great nobleman and the master of the hill-forts, Khaṇḍe Rāya Hemmādi Deva made a grant of the Kottūru-vṛtti to some one whose name is effaced in the record.⁴

The ancient prestige of Kōttūru was maintained in the Vijayanagara age. In a royal grant dated A. D. 1354 of king

¹ This inscription refers to the reign to the Western Cālukyan monarch Vikramāditya VI, but falls within the reign of Trailokyamalla, Talla III. (*S. I. I. ibid.*, No. 264, pp. 279-280)

² *S. I. I. op. cit.*, No. 331, p. 350.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 332, p. 351. It may be observed here that Beṇṇekallu was not the chief town in Kōgaḷi 500, as maintained by the Editor of the Kallieśvara temple record, but only the chief village. For the original runs thus—*Kōgaḷya-aṇṇūraam Beṇṇekallu-haṇṇeradakkam-mukhyavād Beṇṇekal-grāma-dalu*. This record is dated A. D. 1226. *S. I. I.*, *ibid.*, No. 343, pp. 362-366.

⁴ *Ep. car.* XI, Jl. 30, p. 87. It cannot be made out whether Koṭṭurahaḷli which figures in a record dated A. D. 1287 (*Ep. Car.* VII, Sk. 312, p. 153) was the same as the Koṭṭūra discussed in these pages. Perhaps it was not, because it is called a *haḷli* or village, while the Koṭṭūra of our record was always the capital of a division.

Bukka Rāya, that ruler is represented as having given to Rāmanna Jyoisa (descent stated), the astrologer of Hariharadevapura, the village of Mittaliganakatte or Mittaligonakotte, which the king had ordered to be built within the limits of Hariharadevapura in the Uchangivēthe belonging to the Kottūru-cāvadi.¹ The word *cāvadi* or hall used in this connection is noteworthy, in as much as it suggests that even in the first half of the fourteenth century, Kottūru continued to be one of the provincial seats of the Vijayanagara Empire.

The political importance of Kottūru is still further proved by another record of A. D. 1382 of the reign of the next Vijayanagara monarch Harihara II. This ruler granted the village of Śankaripura in the Hariharasīma in the Uchangivēthe belonging to the Kottūru-cāvadi within the Vijayanagara kingdom, to the learned Brahman Lingarasa (descent stated).² In a record dated A. D. 1406 of the reign of the Vijayanagara king Deva Rāya II, three villages of Jigale, Kunduru and Horasandra are said to have been attached to the town of Bhānuvatī which belonged to the Kottūru-sīma and the Uchangivēthe.³

The Vijayanagara monarchs, as I have amply proved elsewhere,⁴ always maintained the traditional administrative divisions of the land. This explains why Kottūru-cāvadi still continued to figure in the Vijayanagara records. In A. D. 1516 in the reign of the great Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya, a minister was placed over Kottūru. His name was Aruba-Timmana Nāyaka. In that year he granted the village of Dannāyakanapura for the charity water-lift at Soge.⁵ Nonabanasavikere is said to have been in the *vaḍa* of Kottūru in A. D. 1527, when the high official called Rāyasada Nārāyanappa was placed over Kottūru.⁶ Three years later (1530) in the reign of Acyuta Deva, Kottūru again figures. The record that gives us this information tells us that the village named Baḷḷapura, which was granted as a gift, was situated in Hariharasīma belonging to Pāṇḍyanād which was a

¹ *Ep. Car.* XI, Dg. 67, p. 63.

² *Ibid.* XI, Dg. 68, p. 67. ³ *Ibid.* Dg. 103, p. 71.

⁴ *Saletpore, Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire*, II, *passim*.

⁵ *S. I. I.* IX P. II, No. 503, p. 516. ⁶ *Ibid.* No. 522, p. 530.

subdivision of Ucohangiventhe which itself formed a part of Kottūru-cāvadi.¹

In the reign of Emperor Sadāsiva Rāya the references to Kottūru are copious. An undated stone inscription found at Nandihalli, Hadaganahalli taluka, Bellary district, registers a gift made by that Emperor of the village of Volalugundi Bhayirapura, surnamed Gopināthapura, in Kottūru-sime to the temples of Bañjēśvara and Gopinātha at Timmalāpura, which was an agrahāra set up by Rāmapayya.² The barbers of Baguli in Kotturu-sime in A. D. 1547, during the reign of the same monarch, were exempted from the payment of certain specified taxes by that Vijayanagara ruler.³ In the same year Bemma Nāyaka granted the village of Amaragere in Rangapura-sthala situated in Kottūru-sime, as a gift to Varunakauṭa Odeyar.⁴ The royal order of A. D. 1547 exempting the barbers from paying certain taxes, was extended in January to the barbers of Kottūru-sime, and in February of the same year to the barbers of Maiduru also in the Kottūru-sime.⁵ Kṛsnappa Nāyaka was governing over the Kottūru 30 division which belonged to the Kōgali province in 1550, also in the reign of the same monarch Sadāsiva Rāya.⁶ In the record dated A. D. 1551 we are informed that Kotturu-sime had been granted to Kṛsnappa Nāyaka himself. This record clearly proves that the ancient administrative divisions were in tact under Vijayanagara. For it informs us that Kottūru-sime formed a part of the Kōgali-venthe which was a sub-division of Pāndyanādu which belonged to the Hastināvati-valita (*Hastināvati-valitada Pūṇḍyanāḍa-valagana Kōgaliya-venthe*

¹ *Ep. Car.* XI, Dg. 28, p. 38.

² *Ibid.* of 1914, Rangacharya, *op. cit.*, I, By. 224, p. 288, *S. I. I.*, IX, P. II, No. 632, p. 677.

³ *S. I. I.*, IX, P. II, No. 623, p. 627.

⁴ *S. I. I.*, IX, P. II, No. 626, pp. 629-630.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Nos. 628, 629, pp. 631. In view of all these records, the insertion of the word Kottūru in the record dated A. D. 1548 by the Editors (*S. I. I.*, IX, P. II, No. 630, p. 632) should be changed to Kottūru. For "Kottūru-sime" is not mentioned in inscriptions; and there could not have been two *Simes*-Kottūru-sime and Kottūru-sime in the same *valita* of Kōgali almost in the same year.

⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 640, p. 638. See also 71 of 1904; Rangacharya, *op. cit.*, I, By. 263, p. 294.

yake-saluva Kottūru-simeya).¹ This territorial division is repeated in detail in 1580 when, some time after the great battle of Rāksasa-Tangadi, the Vijayanagara Emperor Tirumala Rāya was ruling from Ānagondi, and his officer Vādī Nāyaka exempted the shepherds of Kottūru-sime from a tax on their sheep.²

When the capital was transferred from Ānagondi to Penugonda, Kottūru was naturally transferred to the Penugondā rāya. This is evident from references to it in the seventeenth century records which mention Kottūru as having been situated in the Penugonda-rāya. Thus a copper plate inscription of the last Vijayanagara ruler Śrī Ranga Rāya, dated in A D 1665, March the 15th, describes Kottūru-sime as having been a part of Penugonda-rāya.³ Kottūru-sime is said to have been a sub-division of Kōgali-venthe in a paper sanad of A. D. 1785, December the 17th, granted by the Keladi king Basavappa Nāyaka to the Śringerī guru Sacchidānanda Bhārati.⁴ Kōgali mentioned in this record was evidently the same Kogali the history of which has been outlined above.

The numerous records cited above prove beyond doubt that Kottūru was attached to the larger division of Uchangī. This locality is one of the most famous hill-fortresses in Southern and Western Indian history. It had a glorious history behind it, and it was called by its other name Uchāśrngī. It lies in the south-west of the Bellary district in the Harapanahalli tāluqa, just near the Mysore border at Dāvanagere. It is in latitude 14° 34', and Long. 76° 7'.⁵ Uchangī figures as one of the provincial seats of the early Kadambas of Halasi.⁶ It later on

¹ *S. J. I.* IX. P. II. No. 685, p. 677. It cannot be made out whether this is the same record of the same date, noticed first by Sewell (*Antiquities of Southern India*, I, p. 110), and then by Rangacharya (*op. cit.* I By 433, p. 314).

² *S. J. I.* IX. P. II. No. 685, pp. 677-8.

³ *My Archl Report for 1924*, p. 92. ⁴ *Ibid* for 1933, p. 233.

⁵ There is another Uchangidurga about 50 miles to the east by north from the Uchangidurga of Bellary. This other Uchangidurga lies three miles to the east of Molakalmūra in the Doddarī tāluqa of the Chitaldoorg district, Mysore State. (*Fleet, Dy. Kan. Dts.* p. 285, P. 285, n. 5). But this other Uchangidurga does not seem to have been as famous as the more ancient hill-fortress in Harapanahalli tāluqa.

⁶ Rice, *Mys. Inscriptions*, p. XXXIX, *My. & Coorg*, p. 26, where Rice identifies it with the hill-fortress in Molakalmūra. See also Fleet, *ibid*, p. 285.

became the capital of the whole of the Nolambavādi 32,000 Province, under the well-known feudatory family of the Pāndyas of Ucchangī.¹

From the ninth century A. D., onwards the great Ucchangī hill-fortress figures in inscriptions. The Ganga king Mārasimha is credited with the capture of this impregnable fortress, as is related in the Āṇjaneya temple stone inscription found at Karagada, in Belūr tāluka and dated in A D 971, Prajotpatti, Āsādna. The ruler whom king Mārasimha defeated is called in that record merely Rājāditya (*Ucchangiya-kōṭeḡe Rājādityana-kūṭaḡike*).² In a later but mutilated record dated A D. 974, and found at Sravana Belgola, we are informed that king Mārasimha³ reduced to powder the hill-fortress of Ucchangī. In the same Sravana Belgola record we have the important detail of the royal family to which Rājāditya belonged. Mārasimha, otherwise called *Gaṅga-cūḍāmana*, we are informed in this record, "became a forest fire to the lion Rājāditya, the crest-jewel of the Cālukyas"³ This fact of Rājāditya's having been a scion of the Cālukya royal house is to be borne in mind in our estimate of the identification of the royal family to which Svāmīdatta, the contemporary of Samudra-Gupta belonged, as will be narrated towards the end of his paper

The Ucchangī hill-fortress continued to be important in the first half of the eleventh century A. D. This is proved by the stone inscription set up near the Tavakeśvarasvāmi temple at Ucchangī-durga itself in the Harapanahalli tāluka. It belongs to the reign of the Western Cālukya ruler Āhavamalla, when his son the Vengimāndalesvara (Lord of Vengi) Viśnuvardhana Vijayaditya ruled over the Nolambavādi 32,000 Province, and the latter's deputy Devappayya was placed over the division called Ucchangī 30. This record gives the following legendary origin of the hill-fortress.—That in the middle of the Kadambavādi-nāḍ there shone the mountain fortress of Ucchangī which in

¹ *Ep. Car.* VII, Intr. p. 25; *ibid* XI, Intr. p. 16 ff, *Mys and Coorg*, pp 58, 59, 76, 92, 100, 102.

² *My. Arch. Rept.* for 1911, p. 37; *Ep. Car.* II., Intr. pp, 44 45, *ibid*, XV, No. 308, p. 79.

³ *Ep. Car.* II, No. 59, p. 12.

the *Kṛta yuga* was called Meghanāda, because it had been the abode of a fiend (*rāksasa*) called Meghanāda. In the *Treta yuga* it was the abode of Hiraṇyaka. When he was slain by the god Nārāyaṇa, gold rained from heaven on this hill-fortress, and hence it was called Kanakagiri. In the *Dvāpara yuga* it was the abode of the great ṛṣi Uttāṅga, and hence it was called Uttāṅga-parvata. And in the *Kali yuga* a Brahman maiden called Ucchaṅgi and two others prayed to the god Īśvara and obtained a boon, and hence it was called Ucchaṅgi-parvata.¹

The strategic importance of Ucchaṅgi, and hence of Kottura, in the twelfth century is proved by the records pertaining to the well-known Hoysala House. Its greatest ruler was king Viṣṇu-varḍhana Bittiḡadeva, whose famous general was Ganga Rāja. I have already enumerated elsewhere the military achievements of this great commander.² General Ganga Rāja must have conquered the great Ucchaṅgi fortress in 1123, although the Śrāvana Belgola inscription dated in that year, and another inscription dated in 1131, attributed its conquest to king Viṣṇu-varḍhana himself.³

The conquest of Ucchaṅgi in the reign of that monarch (A. D. 1111-1141) did not mean the annihilation of the ancient family that had ruled over that fortress. In the reign of his grandson, king Ballala II, who ruled from 1173 till 1220, its rulers again gave trouble to the Hoysala State. This necessitated its reduction by king Ballala II. Two records, both found in Śrāvana Belgola, give us valuable details of this conquest. The record dated 1181 contains the following information—That when in the pride of his arm Odeyarasa was with great fury determined to fight, king Ballala marched forth, and surrounding and besieging Ucchaṅgi, whose peaks had been reduced to powder by the blows from the tusks of the groups of lordly elephants of his army, captured king Pāṇḍya, together with his beautiful women, country, treasures, father, and group of horses. Laying siege to

¹ *S. I. I.*, Nr. IX, 126, pp. 107-108.

² See Salletore, *Medieval Jainism*, pp. 114, 116-119, 121-132, ff.

³ *Ep. Car.* II, No. 132, p. 143. But see the text of Nos. 240 and 384, pp. 102, 172, in order to be convinced that this conquest could have been the work only of Ganga Rāja.

Ucchangi, which was for a long time considered impregnable to enemies, king Ballala, a treasury of irresistible prowess, took the fort with ease and seized the kings Kāmadeva and the famous Odeya, and their treasures, women, and troops of horses.¹ The same facts relating to king Kāmadeva and Odeya are mentioned in the later record dated 1195.² We have to infer from the record of 1181 that the rulers of Ucchangi belonged to the Pāndya House, under whom the Cālukyas might have continued to govern

From whatever point of view we may look at Ucchangi, and, therefore, at Kottūra,— traditional, geographical, or political,— it is clear that it was in Karnāṭaka proper. This means that Samudra Gupta entered the north-eastern part of Karnāṭaka, and conquered the ruler of that region. Here we come across some difficulties which need clarification. I shall take the order of conquests as given in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription. It has been mentioned above that the conquest of Kottūra is placed after the conquest of Pistapura and before that of Ērandapalle. Of these Pistapura was undoubtedly the modern Pithapuram (12 miles north-east of Cocanada) in the East Godāvari district. It was the capital of ancient Kalinga.³ Whether we are to take the difficult passage in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription— "*Pastapuraka-Mahendragiri-Kautilūraka-Svāmadatta*," along with Fleet, as referring to king Mahendra of Pistapura,⁴ or along with Dr. Bhandarkar and Mr. Ramachandramurty, as referring to a ruler called Mahendragiri,⁵ is beside the point for the present, because we are concerned here with the order of the conquests in the Ērandapalle-Pistapuram region.

¹ *Ep. Car.* II No. 327, p. 136 ² *Ibid.* No. 335, p. 142

³ Allan, *Gupta Coins* p. XXII, Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 300 (1924 ed.).

⁴ Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 7, (n 2), 13. Granting that we accept Fleet's interpretation that Kottūra was on the hill, it may be made to agree with the location of Kottūra given above thus — That Kottūra is spoken of as belonging to the fortress of Ucchangi which was itself a hill-fortress. It may be remembered here that Kottūra is described in epigraphs as having formed a part of province (*vēṣṭhe*) of Ucchangi.

⁵ D. R. Bhandarkar, *Indian Culture*, II, pp. 761-762; V. S. Ramachandramurty, *ibid.* III, pp. 230-231.

From Pistapuram Samudra Gupta marched in a south-westerly direction to Kottūra in the Bellary district, and then turned his attention to Ērandapalle. A discussion of the location of this latter place will convince us that Samudra Gupta had, indeed, entered the heart of the Deccan. Two views have been expressed concerning Ērandapalle. Dr S. K. Ayyangar and Prof. V. Ranga-charya maintain that Ērandapalle of the Allahabad Pillar inscription was no other than Ērandapalle in the Ganjam district.¹ The other view is that of Fleet, Allan, and Smith, who identify it with Ērandol in the Khandesh district.²

I am inclined to accept the latter view that Ērandapalle of the Allahabad Pillar inscription was no other than Ērandol in the Khandesh district for the following reasons. If we agree to the idea that the scribe of the Allahabad Pillar inscription has mentioned the conquests of Samudra Gupta in some order, then, we cannot accept the view that the Ērandapalle of the Allahabad Pillar record was in the Ganjam district. For, according to the latter view, it would mean that Samudra Gupta first conquered Pistapura, and then marched north-eastwards to the Ganjam district. This would mean that he had left an enemy in the rear when he first struck at Pistapura. We cannot credit Samudra Gupta with such a tactless blunder. What makes us assert this with confidence is the fact that if Samudra Gupta had really gone north-eastwards to the Ganjam district, the scribe of the record would have mentioned first Pistapura, next Ērandapalle, and then Kottūra. But Kottūra is placed *after* Pistapura and *before* Ērandapalle thereby justifying our assumption that Ērandapalle must have been located in a region which was geographically

¹ S. K. Ayyangar, *Studies in Gupta History*, p. 33, C. P. of 4 of 1912-3, Ranga-charya, *A Topographical List of Inscriptions in the Madras Presy.*, III, pp. 1674-1675. The late Dr K. P. Jaysawal wrote thus about Damana of Ērandapalle: "and Damana of Ērandapalle must have been a 'rāja' or ruler of the status of a district officer under Svāmīdatta of Pistapura" (Jaysawal, *History of India*, p. 37). This is one of the many conjectures which vitiate Dr Jaysawal's interesting work.

² Fleet, *J. R. A. S.* for 1898, pp. 368-9; Allan, *Gupta Coins*, pp. XXIII-XXIV; Smith, *E. H. I.* pp. 284 (1914 ed.), 301 (1924 ed.).

nearer to Kottūra than to Pistapura. Ērandol in the Khandesh district is precisely such a place. While we are in the dark as to the antiquity and importance of Ērandol, we may note that from this place in the Khandesh district, Samudra Gupta turned south-eastwards, and marching through a most difficult country, presented himself before Kāñci (the modern Conjeevaram near Madras,) where ruled the Pallava king Vispugopa whom he subjugated¹

It must be admitted that with the available evidence, we do not know the reasons which prompted Samudra Gupta to turn south-eastwards from Ērandol to Kāñci. All that we may hazard to point out is that the powerful Pallavas of Kāñci, whose sway extended over a large part of the centre of the Madras Presidency, along the coast and in the interior might have been alarmed at the advance of Samudra Gupta, who had struck at Kottūra, a vital part of Karnātaka

Now to the identity of the ruler Svāmidatta, it must also be confessed that we can likewise only conjecture. The name itself—Svāmidatta,—deserves some comment. There have been rulers whose names have ended in *datta*. Thus, in the Ērandmall Boar statue inscription assigned to the 5th century A. D., the names Maheśadatta and Varāhadatta, obviously brothers, are mentioned². I do not think we could identify the Svāmidatta of the Allahabad Pillar inscription with a ruler of this family, because of the following reasons:—(a) Ērān, which lies eleven miles from Khurai (on the G. I. P.), in the Saugor district of the Central Provinces, is too far away from Kottūra. (b) Although Ērān is very intimately connected with Samudra Gupta himself—an inscription of his having been found here,—yet we do not know whether any ruler of Ērān held sway over Kottūra. (c) If a ruler of Ērān called Svāmidatta had really been subjugated by Samudra Gupta, this fact would have been men-

¹ Prof. Dubreuil denies that Samudra Gupta ever entered the Tamil land. *The Pallavas*, p. 14. But he does not give any reason for arriving at this conclusion.

² Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey Report*, X, pp. 87 ff., Hiralal, *Catalogue of Inscriptions in the C. P.*, and *Berar*, p. 48.

tioned either in the fragmentary Ērān pillar inscription which directly deals with Samudra Gupta, or in the inscription relating to Buddha Gupta,¹ or in the Ērān small Boar statue inscription mentioned above. Since in none of these records is there the slightest reference to Svāmidatta's having been a ruler of Ērān, we have to reject this assumption.

There is another royal family some rulers of which bore names that ended in *datta*. This is the ancient royal family of Punnāta which I have outlined elsewhere.² Two rulers of this family were called Nāṣadatta (*circa* 280 A. D.) and Ravidatta (*circa* 400 A. D.). We could have said that Svāmidatta belonged to the Punnāta royal family, especially when we realise that after Ravidatta's time, the Punnāta House came to an end. This assumption receives some support when we observe that Ravidatta's age (*circa* 400) comes very near Samudra Gupta's age (A. D. 335-385).³ But two objections violate this assumption. Firstly, there is nothing to show that the Punnāta rulers, whose capital lay to the extreme south of the modern Mysore State, ever held sway over the Bellary district in which Kottūra was located. And, secondly, the manner in which the Punnāta Royal House after Ravidatta came to an end, conclusively proves that we have to seek elsewhere than in the Punnāta history for the identity of the ruler called Svāmidatta. As I have shewn in my paper on the ancient Punnāta kingdom referred to above, that principality was subverted by the Ganga king Durvinita. If Svāmidatta had been a Punnāta ruler, and Samudra Gupta had subjugated him, we would have had some reference to the ancient Punnāta kingdom in some of the records of the Gupta monarch or of his successors. Since no such reference is met with, we have to assume that Svāmidatta belonged to some other Kārnātaka royal family.

Such an ancient family that was almost contemporaneous with Samudra Gupta was a branch of the Cālukyas, one of whose

¹ Fleet, *Gupta Ins.*, p. 18, Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey Report*, X, p. 89, Fleet, *ibid.*, p. Cunningham, *ibid.*, p. 82, *J.R.A.S.*, VII, p. 633, *ibid.* XXX, p. 17, *ibid.* XXXI, p. 1887, *note*.

² Salestere, *Indian Culture*, pp. 303-317.

³ Allan, *Gupta Coins*, pp. XXXII-XXXIII.

early monarchs was called Svāmīrāja. This ruler, who is said to have been victorious in eighteen battles, was killed by the Western Cālukya ruler of the main line by name king Mangaleśa, as is related in the undated Nērūr grant of king Mangaleśa.¹ Of course the ruler Svāmīrāja who lived in the latter half of the sixth century and the beginning of the seventh century A. D., could never have been a contemporary of Samudra Gupta. But the point to be borne in mind is that in Karnāṭaka was an ancient line of the Cālukyas, one of whose rulers was called Svāmīrāja. It is possible that when more records about this ancient line will be unearthed, we might perhaps have to take Svāmīdatta, the contemporary of Samudra Gupta, as one of the predecessors of Svāmīrāja, who belonged to this early branch of the Cālukya House. All that we may assert for the present is that Kottūra which Samudra Gupta conquered was essentially a Karnāṭaka centre, and that its ruler was in all likelihood a Karnāṭaka king.²

¹ Fleet, *Dy. Kan. Dis.*, pp 347-349

² In the history of the Gangas, too, we come across names of rulers, ending in *datta*. Thus kings Gangādatta, Bhagadatta, and Śrīdatta are mentioned. (Rice, *My. & Coorg*, p 38) It is too premature to suggest that Svāmīdatta belonged to the ancient Ganga House or to the Kadamba royal family which, as mentioned elsewhere, had Uchchangi as one of its provincial capitals (Fleet, *Dy Kan. Dis.*, p 285) An unidentified Cālukya king called Parahitarāja is mentioned in a *viragal* assigned by Fleet to about the 9th century A. D. The place called Kōṭūr where this record was found, lies about 20 miles in a north-westerly direction from Saundatti, the chief town of the Paragad tāluka of the Belgaum district, Bombay Presidency. (Fleet, *Indian Antiquary*, XX, p. 69 ff) Excepting this *viragal* found near the temple of Paramānanda, there is no other record of any importance discovered in this neighbourhood. This Kōṭūr is not mentioned in any record as having been a provincial or a royal seat of any line of kings.

MISCELLANEA

PURUSARTHA, DAIVA AND NIYATI

BY

P. C. DIVANJI

I. *Purusārtha and Mātsanyāya*

The word 'Purusārtha' is a compound word made up of two simple words 'Purusa' and 'Artha'. Thereout the former connotes a human being who is a conglomerate of an individualistic spirit a heart, a mind and a physical body containing, besides the above, a group of five organs of knowledge another of five of action and other subsidiary parts discharging the functions of connecting together the principal ones, supplying them with energy, etc. Thus by the very nature of his constitution man is apt to be engaged, either physically or mentally, in the pursuit of any of the four 'Arthas' (aims or objects), namely 'Dharma' (religious merit), 'Artha' (wealth in cash or kind), 'Kāma' (sensual enjoyment) and 'Mokṣa' (freedom from bondage). The two middle ones are universal and the first is common to a large majority of men, no matter what authority one looks to for guidance, but the last is the special subject of engagement of a limited number of them in all times and climes. So long as the pursuit of any of them does not result in or give cause for an apprehension of any injury to or interference with the freedom of other persons, no unpleasantness arises. This is however practically impossible because man is a social animal and prompted by self-interest and egotism he is consciously or unconsciously led to try to realise his ideals even on taking steps to brush aside others scornfully or even to exterminate them. The natural result therefore of unrestrained individual liberty is the prevalence of what is known in the Nītiśāstra as 'Mātsanyāya, the lawless law, which prevails amongst the creatures of the fish variety and recognizes no other foundation of right except might.

2. In Book III of the *Yogavāsistha* there is an episode of a Rakṣasi named Karkasi relating to this point.¹ Her hunger not being capable of being satiated by the ordinary food, she had taken to human flesh and was therefore always in search of stray human beings who could be pounced upon. Roaming about in a lonely forest she happened to find a king and his minister who had lost their way while out hunting and decided to pounce upon them, justifying that decision by a general statement that the lotus-born (Brahmā) having created the world had made it a rule that a stupid heartless creature shall serve as food for the carnivorous ones.² But in another episode, namely that of Prahlāda, the author of the same work says that the prevalence of this law of the fish during the period, for which Prahlāda was unmindful of his royal duties towards his subjects living in Pātāla over which he ruled on the death of his father at the hands of the Nṛsimha incarnation of Viṣṇu, had led to a state of anarchy and that therefore Viṣṇu was prevailed upon to rouse Prahlāda from his Samādhi and advise him to attend to his duties.³ The *Mahābhārata* too narrates that such a catastrophe had befallen Northern India when King Vena, who was inimical to the principle of the division of the subjects into castes according to their professions, was killed by his subjects and that as he had left no son who could take his place, the leading Brāhmanas of the time hit upon the device of getting a son begotten on his widow by a Brāhmana by the Niyogavidhi. This son was the famous Prthu Vainya.⁴

3. These are instances of events which took place after the establishment of kingship in India. The *Yogavāsistha* also records a tradition⁵ that in early pre-historic times the hearts of all men and women were so pure that they were never prompted to transgress the Dharma based upon respect for one another's sentiments and recognition of the rights of such individual property as was necessary for leading a simple pious life in that hoary age in order that they may, according to their own light, make the best use of their births as members of the

¹ Y V. III. 68-84.

² Op Cit. III. 77. 2°.

³ Op Cit V. 37 7-17

⁴ Mbh VII. 65-71.

⁵ Y V. II. 10 11-44

that Aryan race and therefore there was no dominating political authority and no written texts of law. It also adds that when the divine sages who had been watching the course of events on the earth found that the moral standard of the people, had so deteriorated that they were dominated over by desire, anger, hatred, avarice, etc., and had, under the fits of such passions, begun to quarrel with one another, they started the institution of monarchy which kept the individuals' passions under control. It says that when further on they observed that even the kings of the different territories could not live amicably side by side but continued to fight with one another off and on, in order to extend their dominion and worldly possessions, the said sages propounded the works on Dharmaśāstra, which placed a restraint upon the vagaries of individual monarchs by casting upon them the duty to respect certain rules of municipal and international law based upon moral and spiritual principles, not only in times of peace but also in those of wars, which were thought to be unavoidable when both the parties to a dispute believed that he was in the right.¹

4 As regards the existence of separate Śāstras treating of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa, the *Mahābhārata* records one tradition that there was only one Pāñcarātra Śāstra treating of all the four objects of human pursuit composed by Citra-sikhandi, i. e. the seven great Rsis, Marici and others, that Svayambhū Manu was the first to compose a separate Śāstra based upon it, and that Bhṛgu and Bṛhaspati did so later on.² The *Manusmṛti* of the Bhārgavas records another that Brahmā had originally composed a Dharmaśāstra and taught it to Bhṛgu and that he recited it to the seven sages Marici and others.³ The *Kūmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana records a third that Prajāpati had originally composed a very big work on the Trivarga, i. e., the principles of Dharma, Artha and Kāma, that thereout, first of all, Manu separated the Dharmaśāstra, then Bṛhaspati the Arthaśāstra and lastly Nandī, a follower of Mahādeva, the Kāmaśāstra.⁴ It appears from the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya⁵ that there was a difference of opinion amongst the Vedic scholars as to

¹ Op Cit. II 11 4-18² Mbh. XII 3 163 27-45³ M. S. I. 58-60, 118-19⁴ K. S. I. 6⁵ K. A. S. I. 2, 1.

whether there were four independent Vidyās (sciences), namely Anvikṣikī, Trayī, Vārtā and Danda or the last three only, or the last two only, or the last only, that Kauṭīlya was of the view that they were four and that that which Vātsyāyana has recorded is the view of the Mānavas, according to which there were three independent Vidyās, namely the Trayī, Vārtā and Danda, the Anvikṣikī, which according to Kauṭīlya includes the Sāṃkhya, Yoga and Lokāyata, being only a Trayīviśesa, i. e. to say, a special development of the Trayī, the foundation of the Dharmaśāstra. This tradition besides being a comprehensive one, is older also than that recorded by Vātsyāyana because even according to Jolly, who places the Arthaśāstra in about 300 A. D. as against Fleet and Shamasastry who place it in 300 B. C.,¹ the said work is older than that of Vātsyāyana and substantially agrees with that contained in the exposition of the Nārāyaṇīya Dharma in the *Śāntiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata*.²

5. In the concluding verse in the passage containing a resumé of the contents of the work it is said that " it also contains a description of the Maryādās (restraints) of various sorts imposed on the earth and in Svarga " ³ This implies that the author of the work had thought it necessary to impose various kinds of restraint on the freedom of the individual souls to act as they liked. These restraints must naturally have percolated in the Ekadeśī Śāstras which had been based thereon. It comes to this then that while the Śāstras relating to each of the four Puruṣārthas take it for granted on the one hand that each individual soul is free to act as he likes for the realisation of his ambition, they on the other hand impose certain restrictions on his activities for the benefit of society or a portion of it.

6. Although in the present age, the old Śāstras have ceased to have binding force and an individual has comparatively more liberty to pursue his own ideals in the matters of religion and social relations, the authority of the state is there to check individual activities by enacting a *Law of the Land* in the interest of the society or the state even in those matters and in several

¹ Introduction by Jolly pp. 21, 24-29, 46-47. Shamasastry's edition-Introduction by Fleet.

² Mbh. XII. 2. 163. 26-45, ³ Op. Cit. verse 37.

19 [Annals, B. O. R. I.]

other matters in which formerly states did not interfere. So after all, the position is that ever since the dawn of civilization on the earth, the freedom of the individual to act on the physical plane is to a certain extent placed under restraint or even counter-acted by some superior powers on earth, whether he does or does not approve of it or even whether he does or does not understand the reason for which the restraint may have been imposed or the counteraction resorted to. This is realised more at a time when the state in which the individual resides is at war with another state or when the ideal of an individual comes into conflict with that of another with better means at his command. This kind of obstruction to the realisation of one's aim on the physical plane is however liable to be removed if one has a very strong will, a readiness to make the necessary sacrifice and the quantity and quality of strength required for the realisation of the specific aim in view.

II. *Puruṣārtha and Dāiva*

7. Now, an ordinary man can come to know of the existence of such beings only as are his equals or inferiors spiritually. That is so because his means of knowledge primarily are his five senses of knowledge by which he comes into contact with the outside world. But just as there are several classes of beings having bodies grosser than that of man, it is quite possible that there may be others having bodies subtler than his. With the help of his intellect, provided it is initially sharp or made so by the proper method, he can come to know of the existence and movements of some such, can study them and make them agreeable to his own aims. But *a posteriori* knowledge is never complete and that is the reason why the scientific theories of yesterday are exploded to-day and those of to-day are liable to be exploded to-morrow with the possible acquisition of better means of knowledge. On the other hand, the faithful in every religion believe that there are certain orders of superior and inferior beings who have no physical bodies. These purposes may as well be opposed to those of human beings as commensurate with them. In the former case, human efforts however sincere and persistent prove fruitless and the human beings concerned cannot account for the strange results. There must however be some reason why such beings

should come in the way of the fulfilment of man's desire by his own sacrifice and exertion. The Indian sages of the later Vedic age, which preceded the births of Buddha and Mahāvira, had thought over this subject carefully and come to the conclusion that the good and bad spiritual forces, whose operation is indicated by inexplicable events in one's life, are set into motion by one's own actions done in previous births. They either help or hamper man in his pursuits. This is the famous *Law of Karma*, which forms the foundation of the religious beliefs and practices of the Buddhists and Jains as well as the Hindus. The text-books on Dharma, Artha and Kāma recommend the adoption of several appropriate remedies for counteracting obstacles coming from unseen forces in the realisation of one's ideals falling in any of the three categories and the works on the Mokṣasāstra recommend the adoption of diverse means for securing complete freedom from the miseries, including that of the liability to frequent births and deaths, which the operation of the said law brings in its train.

8. The writers of the scientific treatises above-referred to seem to take it for granted that it is possible to remove the obstacles even though they may be arising from unseen forces. They do not, as a rule, enter into a discussion as to why it is possible to do so. The *Yogavāsistha Mahārāmāyana*, which calls itself a *Mokṣopāya*, is not a work of that class. Unlike the scientific works it enters into a long discussion in Book II as to the scope for and efficacy of Puruṣārtha, the origin of Daiva and the way of its operation and inspires an optimistic spirit in the reader by proving that Daiva is capable of being supplanted, provided one has a very very strong will and persistently follows any of the numerous remedies which have been recommended therein for the realisation of one's ideal.¹ The argument advanced therein is in substance this that Daiva is nothing else but the result of your own past actions, that in the conflict between it and your Puruṣārtha, like a duel between two goats, that is bound to predominate which has a superior potentiality, that it is in your hands to establish the superiority of the latter, that a strong will and a

¹ Y. V. II, 4-9; VII a, 29, 8-11; 51, 47; 55, 31-34; 64, 9-36; 73, 7-8.

persistent effort only would enable you to do that, and that they will enable you to put up a strong fight if you keep up faith in the doctrine that the Purusa being the repository of all powers whatever is capable of achieving anything that he desires to achieve, including even the position of Prajāpati. The last point is illustrated therein by the episode of the ten sons of a Brāhmaṇa named Indu given in Book III, which is to the effect that they having wished to become Prajāpatīs and resorted to the necessary means towards that end did in fact become Prajāpatīs in the next Kalpa, though not either in that very life or even after several fresh births in that Kalpa.¹

III. *Purusārtha and Niyati*

9. The fact that the sons of Indu had to wait and persist in their effort and to submit to numerous privations till the end of the Kalpa before being the Prajāpatīs at the commencement of the succeeding Kalpa introduces us to the existence of one more factor which we must take into consideration while determining the capabilities of an individual soul. That factor is what is called *Niyati* in the Paurāṇic works. That term is a noun derived from the root *yam* with *ns* meaning 'to restrain, curb, control or govern.' Its etymological meaning therefore is 'that which restrains, curbs, controls or governs something else.' Its derivative meanings are the force which keeps under control or regulates the movements of all the creatures, animate as well as inanimate, i.e. to say, 'the Inner Regulator of all creatures' or 'the fixed order of things prevailing in the universe which keeps everything within the limits pertaining to its own inherent nature.' Essentially the human soul being of the same nature as the soul of the universe, i.e. to say, Brahman as it has become manifest, is completely free and therefore capable of attaining the fulfilment of all its desires. It was because of the truth of that principle that the sons of Indu having so wished could be the lords of creatures of diverse sorts. But it was as the sons of an individual Brāhmaṇa that they had conceived the idea of being so great and the realisation of that idea meant the displacement of the existing Prajāpatīs, who were far more highly developed

¹ Y. V. III. 85-89

souls than the sons of Indu and the subversion of the order which had been fixed by Brahmā, the Creator, long before the sons of Indu conceived that idea as comparatively far more limited souls. The latter were not capable of doing any of those things. That was the reason why they had to wait and persist in their effort till the end of the Kalpa, when according to the original Samkalpa of Brahmā, the lives of the existing Prajāpatis were to come to an end. If the object of their desire had been such as could have been achieved without coming into conflict with such higher souls, less time and less effort would have been required, as was the case with the Brāhmaṇa Vasistha and his wife who had conceived the desire to attain to the glory and dignity of a king and queen, they having been born as King Padma and his Queen Līlā,¹ or with Gādhi who only wished to have an experience of the nature of Viṣṇu's Māyā, he having had it in that very life while he was bathing.²

10. Besides giving several such illustrations of the nature and power of this preponderating force the author of the *Yogavāsistha* has explained them in great details at several places in that work and explained its origin also.³ The gist of what he says in the passages cited below is that Niyati is the order which prevails not only on this earth but also in the mid-air and in the different regions in the heavens, that it is binding on all creatures, gross and subtle, animate and inanimate, and that it was required to be established for otherwise there would have been chaos and injustice in all the three worlds. That being so it could have no existence prior to the creation of the worlds and after their destruction. But so long as the universe subsists, there is no escape from it even for Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra, who are inferior gods charged with certain functions with reference to the universe, are Jīvas though of a higher order, and are in the same position as ministers in any government on earth. A wise man, instead of trying to transgress

¹ Y. V. III. 15-67. ² Op. Cit. V. 44-49.

³ Op. Cit. II. 10, III. 53 24-40, 65. 8-20, 32, IV. 10 24-73, 13-16, 36 30; 45. 28; 56. 12; V. 1. 19, 6. 1-18, 24 17-40, 30 24-29, 61. 42-48, 75. 37-35; VII a. 20. 16-41, 21. 23-25, 37, 77. 6 9, 88. 16, 104, 23-49; 105. 17, 43-44; VII b. 19-20.

it, tries to know its full nature and so long as his physical body lasts, acts in consonance with it without egotism, so that his acts may not create Vāsana like those done for self-satisfaction and therefore with a sense of egotism. He has no difficulty in knowing its nature because it is the inherent power of God made manifest in the diverse objects as the inherent nature of each of them severally, just as the same electric power generated at a central power-house makes itself manifest in diverse forms in different kinds of lamps, fans, stoves, mills, factories, workshops, etc., situated at varying distances and levels. Such being the case there is in fact no miracle in the world, for, a miracle is an event which cannot be explained logically as an effect from a known cause and there is none which cannot be so explained. It may be that some events may appear miraculous to some people. But there are others who are better informed than them and can therefore logically account for events which they cannot. They can do so because there are certain kinds of gems, certain mystic symbols or formulas and certain rare herbs which have the efficacy of causing events, which appear to those to whom the gems, symbols or formulas and herbs are unknown, to be contrary to the fixed order of things, otherwise called the *Law of Nature*, but to those who are aware of them to be quite in consonance with that order or law. It is not by the knowledge of the absolute truth that the knowledge of these things is acquired. There are separate sciences for its acquisition. Therefore it is only when they are learnt, that one acquires the knowledge about them. And their mere knowledge even is not enough. Each science has its own method for the realisation of the truth which it inculcates. If it is properly followed one can even create such extraordinary events. The desire to do so is however a thorn in the path of self-realisation because there is no possibility of such a desire being ever satiated, and so long as it is not satiated, it acts as a hindrance in concentrating one's mind on the pure self. On this point there is an episode in the latter portion of the *Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa* of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, namely that of King Vipāścit,¹ the materials for which seem to have been taken from the

¹ Op. Cit. VI b. 108-59.

Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna for the purpose of convincing the reader of the nature of Avidyā as explained by the sage Vasistha.

IV. Conclusion

11 It follows from the above that a human being's ambitions and activities must, in order to be successful, be confined within the limits imposed by the world-order. If even a Jīva who has risen to be a Brahman, Viṣṇu or Rudra cannot change it, much less can a poor Jīva on whose powers there are so many limitations besides those on any of the three gods. These limitations operate only as regards the acquisition of this or that power on the physical or metaphysical plane because the ambition to be the proud possessor of the power of a god or a godling does not differ from that to be a proud emperor or a president of a republic or a prime minister of an empire or of a part of it or, for the matter of that, from that to be a high priest or a millionaire or even to be the husband of a beautiful and cultured wife. In the matter of self-knowledge and self-realisation they do not because the path for them lies in quite the opposite direction and all the kit that one is likely to stand in need of, while proceeding along it, is of such a nature that one can acquire it without coming into conflict with any other Jīva, high or low, and Niyati, the Divine or the Supreme Power will always be there to help one cross the hurdles that lie along the path, provided one has a strong will and a capacity to make the requisite sacrifices, and makes a persistent effort for the realisation of that highest ideal.

SOME FORGOTTEN SANSKRIT POETS OF KARNĀTAKA

BY

DASHARATHA SHARMA

The object of this short note is to correct a few mistakes that are to be found in Mr. *Srikantha Sastri's* paper published under the above caption in the *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Annals*.¹

The first forgotten Karnāṭaka poet mentioned by Mr. Sastri is one Amarānanda. Actually he is none else than the celebrated Amaruka. The verse "*ekatrāṣaṣaṣamsthutā*" is to be found on page 20 of the *Amarukaśataka* of the Nirṇayasāgara Press and has been commented on by the Paramāra ruler Arjunavarmamadeva (c. 1211-1225 A. D.)

According to Mr. Sastri, the Dīḡambara scholar Kumudacandra was defeated by Hemacandra. But if he consults either the *Mudritakumudacandra* of Yaśaścandra, a contemporary work, or the *Prabhāvākacanta*, he will find that the credit of having beaten him belongs actually to Vādi-Devasūri.

In some other cases, Mr. Sastri appears to assign to Karnāṭaka a number of poets who did not actually belong to it. But as he is himself far from sure on these points, it would perhaps be unnecessary to criticise his findings.

PIPPALIKĀ

BY

DASHARATHA SHARMA

In his paper on the *Bhūpālavalabhī* published in the Silver Jubilee Volume of the *Annals*,² Mr. S. L. Katre identifies Pippalikā of the Ms. described by him with Piplīā, a small *Jāgīr* held by Khelī Cauhāns in the Ujain district of the Gwalior State. Actually, however, it is Piplīā, a second class *Jāgīr* in Mewar governed now, as in Samvat 1781, the year of the copying of the Ms., by Śaktāwat Rāṇpūts who, as noted by Mr. Katre also, trace their descent from Śaktasingh, a brother of Mahārāṇa Pratāpsingh. Bāghjī Śaktāwat was one of the Sardars of Mahārāṇa Saṅgrāmasingh (V. 1773-1791), who appointed him as his *Vakil* at the court of Chatrapati Shāhūjī. As this Maratha monarch regarded himself as a descendant of the Mewar royal family, he, according to the *Vamsabhāṣkara*, addressed Bāghjī as *kūkā* (uncle).³

¹ *Annals*, B. O. R. I. Vol. XXIII, pp. 415-423.

² *ibid* pp. 224-241.

³ *Vamsabhāṣkara*, pp. 3222-23, G. H. Ojha-History of Udaipur, II, p. 619,

**ĀVĪNDRAKALPALATĀ, A HINDĪ WORK BY
KAVĪNDRĀCĀRYA SARASVATĪ**

BY

DASHARAJTA SHARMA

Some time back I received a complimentary copy of Śrīyut P. K. Gode's learned paper on Kavindrācārya Sarasvatī. With my interest in this eminent and practical ascetic aroused by this, I requested Sāhityaratna Pandit Rāmanīwās Hārīta of Sri Anūpa Sanskrit Library, Bikaner, to look through the books under his charge, and was fortunate enough to learn from him of two Hindi works connected with this scholar, viz., the *Kavindra-candrikā*, a collection of addresses in Hindī similar to those in Sanskrit, already published in the *Kavindrācandrodaya*, and the *Kavindra-kalpalatā*, a eulogistic work composed by Kavindrācārya himself.

As the former of these compositions gives us the names of all the chief Benares Hindi poets of Shahjahan's time, I have contributed a note about it to the *Nāgari Pracārīnī Patrikā*, the premier Hindī quarterly of Benares. The other work, which forms the subject of this short Paper, begins with three Sanskrit verses of salutation to Vāṇī, Bhavānī, Śiva, and Gaṇeśa; the statement that Kavindra is the author of the *Kalpalatikā*, and the wish that it might be read by people to the end of our *Kalpa*. Then follow the following autobiographical details about the poet:—

"He, first, lived on the bank of the river Godāvarī, from whence he migrated to Benares. He became a Samnyāsī before he was hardly out of his boyhood. He was a follower of the *Āivalāyana śākhā* of the *Rgveda* and had composed innumerable books including commentaries on the *Vedas*. He had ended the troubles of Prayāga and Kāśī and composed these verses in vernacular, though it was somewhat below his dignity to do so."

The remaining portion of the work falls into the following parts:—

- (1) *Kavittas* in honour of Shāhjahān.
- (2) *Dhrupadas* " " " "
- (3) *Viṣṇupadas* - 10 in number.
- (4) Verses devoted to *Tattvajñāna* (the problem of truth).
- (5) *Kavittas* in honour of Dārāshāh.
- (6) " " " " Begam Sāhab.

- (7) Miscellaneous (*nānūsayaku*) verses.
 (8) A few more verses in honour of Dārāshāh.
 (9) *Kavittas* in honour of Prince Murād.

The amount of historical information in the book is not, unfortunately, however, very great. From the first two sections, we at the most learn that Shāhjahān conquered parts of the Deccan, reduced the Bijapuris to submission, forced the ruler of Golkundā to obey his authority, carried devastation to Bokhārā and Khorāsān, captured Kandhār, and founded the magnificent city of Shāhjahānābād. The 23rd *Dhruvada* describes the Emperor's throne, most probably the celebrated *Takht-i-Tūs*. The philosophic verses describe the chief Indian schools of thought, specially the Vedānta. They were probably meant for the instruction of Prince Dārā Shikoh (Dārāshāh of our Ms.) who is known to have been interested in the Upanisadic way of thinking. Kavindrācārya calls him *Wah Ahad* (heir-apparent) and credits him with the knowledge of all the categories of the *Tarkatātra* (Logic and Atomism).¹

The Begam Sāhab of section 6 looks Jahānārā, for the poet prays that she might live for ever with the affection of her father (obviously Shāhjahān) and her brother (Dārā Shikoh). Murād is evidently the fourth son of Shāhjahān. His being selected for praise in preference to Shujā and Aurangzeb, respectively the second and third sons of the Emperor, perhaps indicates that he was either very generous or less disliked at the court than his two other brothers left unnoticed and unsung by Kavindrācārya.

In the miscellaneous portion, we find the name of one Sayyad Hayat Khān, probably one of Shāhjahān's commanders and a friend of Dārā. Students of Mughal History should try to trace his name either in the *Badshāhnāmā* or some other source for Shāhjahān's life.

As regards the composition of the book, it might, reasonably, be put somewhere between 1638 and 1657 A. D. One of the limits is fixed by the events described therein and the other by the beginning of the War of Succession and the consequent enmity between Dārā and Murād.

¹ "कोन कदावन मन दारध, कोन नवद्वय, कोन चोर्विस्त्र गुन कोन पांच कर्म कोन सामान्य विशेष, कोन समवाय कोन कोन अनुर अभाव कोन आत्मभर्म कोन त्रिविध काल कोन एकादश विद्या कोन समरूप कोन काहिण रस द्विविध धर्म इनके सब नेद आनत"

THE SHEET ANCHOR OF INDIAN HISTORY,

A CRITICISM

BY

Dasharatha Sharma

In a paper contributed to the Silver Jubilee Volume of the *Annals*, Dr. D. S. Triveda has tried to disprove the identity of Sandrocottus of the Greek writers and Candragupta Maurya, saying that this so-called sheet anchor of Indian History is "the greatest mistake ever committed in the field of Indian chronology, literature and history".¹ These are rather hard words to use. So let us see what his arguments are for going against the considered judgment of other scholars, even though we might not be disposed to think much of the thesis of a writer who remarks that the Asokan inscriptions should, in spite of their different script, language and subject-matter, be ascribed to Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty.

We generally identify Xandrames or Agrammes, the ruler of Magadha at the time of Alexander's invasion, with Nanda Augrasenya, because the story of his father's rise and low birth given by Curtius agrees with that of the first Nanda in the *Mahābodhivaṃśa*, the Jaina *Parīśiṭhaparvan* and the *Purāṇas*. Dr. Triveda however desires that we should regard him as Samudragupta. He believes that it is the story of Samudragupta's father Candragupta I of the Gupta dynasty that is told in the following words of the Greek writer referred to above:—

"His (Agrammes') father was in fact a barber, scarcely staving off hunger by his daily earnings, but who, from his not being uncomely in person, had gained the affections of the queen, and was by her influence advanced to too near a place in the confidence of the reigning sovereign. Afterwards, however, he treacherously murdered the sovereign and then, under the pretence of acting as guardian to the royal children, usurped the

supreme authority, and having put the young princes to death begot the present king".¹

To get at the equation, Xandrames = Samudragupta, he has, however, to make the following suppositions:—

1 Candragupta I of the Gupta dynasty murdered Candrasri, strangely enough identified here with Xandrames even though the latter has been already equated with Samudragupta. This Candrasri is said to have been the penultimate ruler of the Āndhra dynasty

2 Candragupta I begot of Candrasri's widowed queen a son named Pulomā

3 Candragupta I murdered this child of his own a few years later and put himself on the throne.

4 Candrasri = Sundaravarman of the *Kaumudimahotsava*.

5 Pulomā = Kalyānavarman of the same drama.

One has just to look at this formidable list of suppositions to have some idea of the way Dr Triveda has manufactured history to support his pet theory. Actually, he has not a shred of reliable evidence to go by. So he just imagines certain things to have happened and regards them as equally sound arguments in his favour. Not a single *Purāṇa* says or even hints that Pulomā was an illegitimate child and his father was murdered by Candragupta I. So he just throws the *Purāṇas* over-board and presses the poor *Kaumudimahotsava* into service. But where does this drama aver that Kalyānavarman's father was an Āndhra or was named Candrasri? He is actually named Sundaravarman and was the ruler of Pāṭaliputra. And then what makes him equate Kalyānavarman with Pulomā? Does the drama say anywhere that he was, like Dr. Triveda's supposedly illegitimate Pulomā, begotten on Sundaravarman's wife by Candasena?

We do not think that Dr. Triveda has any good replies to these queries, and will, therefore, assume, for the time being at least, that the old equation Agrammes = (Nanda) Augrasenya stands. According to Greek accounts, the man who displaced Agrammes on the throne of Pāṭaliputra was Sandrocottus. Indian

¹ McCrindle, *The invasion of India by Alexander*, p. 222.

accounts give this credit of deposing Nanda (already equated with Agrammes) to Candragupta Maurya. So Candragupta Maurya and Sandrocottus must naturally be regarded as the names of one and the same person.

Equally fallacious are his following arguments against the equation, Candragupta Maurya = Sandrocottus :—

1 Candragupta Maurya cannot be the man meant by Justin's remark that " Sandrocottus was born of humble life," because Mauryas are known to have been a famous Ksatriya clan.

2 The Greek accounts of 327 B C do not contain any reference to Buddhism. This shows that they were written after the Buddhist Mauryan dynasty had ended and the Bhāgavata Gupta rulers had begun ruling India.

The first of the above arguments does not mean much, because Candragupta might have actually occupied a very humble station in life before his elevation to the throne of Pātaliputra, even though he was the member of a well-known caste and family. High and noble parentage and wealth and influence do not always go together. As regards the absence of references to Buddhism, does not Megasthenes speak of the *Śramanas* and their deity, the *Boutta*? Dr Trivedi's attempt to explain these away by regarding *Śramanas* as *Vāṃsprasthas* and *Boutta* as *Bhautikas* is, to say the least, extremely unconvincing, for, we, at least, do not know of any phonetic law by which the equation between *Boutta* and *Buddha* might be disallowed and that suggested by Dr. Trivedi permitted? Does he really regard *Bhautika* as phonetically nearer to *Boutta* than the word *Buddha* suggested by other historians? Or is it like many other of his arguments, just a supposition to bolster up an otherwise indefensible position? Further what is there to show that Buddhism had disappeared from the land of its birth as early as 327 B. C.? Does not such a supposition show the learned Doctor's ignorance, or at least supreme neglect, of the accounts of the Chinese travellers Fahien and Hieun Tsang and the numerous Buddhist donations going up to the 12th century of the Christian era?

Other arguments used by Dr. Trivedi to prove that Sandrocottus was not a Maurya are :—

1 Absence of any allusion to a foreign invasion at the time of the fall of the Nanda dynasty and reference on the other hand to a Mleccha incursion at the close of the Āndhra rule.

2 Absence of references to the *sati* system in the Arthaśāstra even though it is referred to by Megasthenes.

3 Reference by a Greek writer to the Āndhras as a very strong power

4 Megasthenes' statement that the king, in addition to his family, must have the surname *Palibothra*, a word which the learned Doctor appears to equate either with Gupta or Aditya.

But are not these arguments too as fallacious as those already noted above? The Nanda dynasty was not ended by any Greek invasion. So why should he expect to find a reference to it in the *Purāṇas*? And as regards the Mlecchas in India at the time of the ending of the Āndhra dynasty, does he not have enough of them in the Śakas, Kushanas and Parthians etc. Further the verse that he quotes in favour of his view, without naming its source, does not say that the Mlecchas ended the Āndhra kingdom? All that it actually states is that many descendants of the Mlecchas would be invading India in the time of the Āndhras, and this we know to be a fact well attested to by history. The Śakas reached India in this period and so did some other foreign races also. So why should Dr. Trivedi suppose that the forces referred to are those of Alexander? Perhaps he has to do so because of his supposition that the Āndhra dynasty ended in 327 B. C., even though such a hypothesis would be against the well attested contemporaneity of a Śātakarni ruler with Rudradāman of the Girnar inscription (Saka year 72 = 150 A. D.) and our knowledge from Chinese and other sources that the Sakas reached India much later than 327 B. C.¹

Nor does the absence of any reference to the *sati* system prove that the Greeks did not reach India in the Mauryan Period, because not only is silence not a good basis for basing sound

¹ In or about 165 B. C. the Yuechi were defeated and expelled from their country by Hiung-nū. The Yuechi in their turn attacked the Sakas in the plains of the Syr Darya and compelled them to move southwards and enter Indian territories. The date of this event would naturally be not earlier than 150 B. C.

theories but also because we find it referred to in the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyana* and the *Purāṇas* too, the composition of all of which should according to a Pandita like Dr. Trivedi, be referred to a pre-Greek period. One has just to read the discussions between Mādrī and Kuntī, and these widowed queens and the *reus* to see that *anumayana* was a well-established Aryan custom of the Period and is actually pre-Mauryan even though we might not find any reference to it in the *Arthasāstra* ¹

Dr Trivedi regards the mention of Āndhras too as a strong power by the Greeks as a point in his favour. Actually, however, it is something against him. From his point of view there should not be any Āndhra power at all after 327 B. C., the year in which their rule is, according to Dr. Trivedi, believed to have ended. Nevertheless if he finds a strong Āndhra power after 327 B. C., should it not suggest to him that his hypothesis is radically wrong somewhere and needs a thorough over-hauling?

Equally fallacious is his argument from the statement of Megasthenes that the king in addition to his family name should have the surname *Pālibothra*. This word is known to be the equivalent of Pātaliputra from the account of Megasthenes himself. So all that it possibly means, (though I should not be dogmatic on the point), is that the Mauryan rulers were, known also as *Pātaliputriyas* after their capital city. It is perhaps better to explain it in this manner than to equate it with Gupta or Āditya, the two words proposed by Dr. Trivedi.

To sum up, we might say that Dr. Trivedi has, throughout his paper, tried to disprove the equation Sandrocottus=Candragupta Maurya by putting forward arguments to prove that the Greeks could not have reached India in the Mauryan Period. If his reasoning be regarded as valid, we should naturally be

¹ Kuntī-

*Aham jyeṣṭhā dharmapatnī jyeṣṭham dharmaphalaṁ mama
avaśyambhāvino bhāvān mā mā Mādrī nivartaya* || 83 ||

Valisampāyana-

*Āṇayastān samāśvāsya
ūcuk Kuntīm ca Mādrīm ca
bhartrānumaranam sārtham phalavannātra sahāyāḥ
yuvābhyāṁ duṣkaram caśad vadantī dvijaputragavāḥ* || 83 ||

Ādi-parva, Chapter CXV (P. P. S. Śāstri's edition).

obliged to equate Sandrocottus of their accounts not with Candragupta Maurya but some other Candragupta, even with Candragupta I of the Gupta dynasty, if it might be proved at the same time that the Gupta dynasty began ruling in 327 B. C. Dr. Trivedi finds the well-established equation, Agrammes = Augrasenya (Nanda) One of the greatest stumbling blocks in the way of his new hypothesis. So he attacks that too with all the force he can, equating Xandrames or Agrammes with Samudragupta, the second ruler of the Gupta dynasty. We, however, regard Dr. Trivedi's attempt at dislodging this old sheet anchor of Indian History, the equation Sandrocottus = Candragupta Maurya, a failure because, as shown above:-

1 He cannot disprove the equation Agrammes = Augrasenya Nanda without getting involved into a number of palpably absurd suppositions.

2 None of his arguments can put Alexander's invasion after the Mauryan Period.

3 His view that the Andhra dynasty ended in 327 B. C. goes against the well-known fact of their rivalry with the Śakas who are known to have entered India not earlier than 150 B. C. or so.

Here we might further add that coins, inscriptions, as well as literary sources¹ prove that the Gupta dynasty was founded on the ruins of the Saka and Kushana empires, both of which naturally flourished after 150 B. C., the earliest year proposed for the entry of the Sakas into India.² Dr. Trivedi's attempt to make Candragupta I of the Gupta dynasty a contemporary of Alexander appears rather surprising after so many years of patient Indian research, though it is certainly no impossible feat for one who can ascribe the Asokan inscriptions to Candragupta II. Dr. Trivedi accuses other historians of "working under preconception and trying to modify or alter the readings to suit their identification." But might not the same charge be levelled against him with equal or even greater justification?

¹ Of literary sources, Dr. Trivedi might be referred to the *Purāṇas*.

² See note 3

REVIEWS

**MARATHA HISTORY (Re-examined) 1295-1707—by Prof.
S. R. Sharma, M A., Fergusson College, Poona.**

Prof. S. R. Sharma, the author of the popular volumes on Mughal History, has now brought out the first volume of his Maratha History. As the title indicates the principal aim of the author is a re-examination of the history of the Maratha nation. In spite of the histories of Sprengel and Scott Waing written before him and that of Kincaid and Parasnis after him, the history of the Marathas by the celebrated Grant Duff has not been replaced as yet

The first intelligent criticism of Grant Duff's history came from a young Deccan Collegian, the late Mr. N. J. Kirtane. Since, then a steadily growing movement is at work to ransack old document and to study, edit and publish them. The great Rajwade has made his name immortal in this field. His conceptions of history and historiography were very large and comprehensive. History to him was not merely the story of the political achievements of the people but must deal with both aspects—the material and moral aspects, including, the economic, the literary, and cultural, the military, and the religious. Since this lead from Rajwade, a number of scholars and associations have engaged themselves successfully in unearthing a large mass of original material bearing on the life and achievements of the Maratha country and its peoples. This work of research is still going on apace but those engaged in it have hardly shown any inclination to produce any histories. Fortunately, however, Rao Bahadur Govind Sakharam Sardesai undertook some fifty years ago, to devote his whole life to the writing of a new history of the Marathas in the Marathi language and his Riyasat bears testimony to his great industry and devotion. An English version of the Riyasat is, it is learnt, under preparation.

The chief aim of Rao Bahadur Sardesai is to supply a reliable narrative of the political history of the Marathas. He has, therefore, naturally entered into details of all important events occur-

ing in Maratha history. He has not applied himself more intently to the task of interpreting Maratha history, so far. Besides, this Riyasat has been written in the Marathi language. Hence, for those who do not understand the Marathi language there is no book which is based on a careful study of all the extant sources and materials. Prof S R. Sharma aspires to do this much-needed service to students of history. "I have" he says "looked at the pattern as a whole without inspecting the parts too closely" and in doing so "I have tried to be artistic without being unscientific, sympathetic without being uncritical and simple without being unhistorical".

This is just the first volume of Prof. Sharma's reexamination of Maratha history. The whole picture is not yet complete and we should not therefore be justified in expressing our opinion fully and finally till we have the finished product before us. As it is in the first part the author has reviewed the course of the history of the Marathas since the fall of Devagiri till the reassertion of Maratha power at the death of Emperor Aurangzeb, a period covering well-nigh four centuries.

This is indeed by far the most glorious and glowing period of the history of the Marhattas. The ancient Maratha dynasty of the Yadavas of Devgiri was superseded first by the Khiljis, followed by the Tughlaks and its place was occupied by the Bahmani dynasty, which after a career of about a century and half, was split up into the Panchsahis or five independent states. It was during the latter period that the Marathas, vanquished at Devgiri, once more re-established their supremacy. This last phenomenon was the Maratha Empire, which fell a prey to the power of the British.

The author has divided his book into ten chapters. The titles thereof will at once show that the author has painted a full picture of the birth, growth and achievement of the Maratha nation. He has attempted to fit the parts into the whole and in their proper places. He wields a powerful pen and shows himself to be a consummate artist who combines skill with proportion.

In the first chapter he depicts the Back-ground of his story. The Marathas of Shivaji and Bajirao are better known than their ancient progenitors, the Marathas of the Yadava period. The

Yadava Empire of the pre-Muslim days was no doubt a Maratha Empire. Hence all historians of Maharashtra have necessarily referred to it. Grant Duff and Kincaid speak of the Devgiri Yadavas. But it was reserved for the genius of Ranade to understand its significance better than others. Prof. Sharma has therefore rightly devoted his opening chapter to the destruction of the Yadava Kingdom by the Khiljis of Delhi. In fact the chapter entitled 'the Back-ground' is an illuminating attempt to explain the downfall of the Yadava power. Unfortunately Prof. Sharma had to rely mainly on Muhammadan sources, as very few non-muslim sources have yet been discovered. The reasons commonly attributed to the sudden collapse of Raja Ramdeo Rao of Devgiri are absolutely unconvincing! How could a wealthy kingdom be crippled in a single battle! One battle of Devgiri or one battle of Rakshastagadi could never afford a rational explanation of the destruction of vast and wealthy kingdoms. It often constitutes the best visible symbol of a long series of causes working in the past. The true explanation, therefore, must be sought for somewhat deeper by peeping into the social, economic and cultural aspects, which condition the whole life of a people and go to shape its character. Perhaps, a minute and patient analysis of the literary evidence available of the Yadava period may go to help us towards supplying a solution. This much-needed research has not yet been carried out. In fact, our historians have not directed their attention towards it seriously as yet. The Hindus collapsed miserably before the onslaught of the Muhammadans, both in the north and south. Could we not find a satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon in the general organisation and make up of the Hindu society? After thus assessing this factor or general cause we may take into consideration any particular causes. Granted that Raja Ramdeo was incapable and inefficient, why should Raghu, Harpaldev, Shankardeo and the two 'tigresses' have failed at the cost of their lives? In spite of sects and in spite of castes, the Hindu society, has outlived these thousands of years. It has often had to bend but it has never broken completely. We must study its history both as that of a whole as well as also of its constituent limbs or parts. The

Yadava period must be restudied in detail in this way. However, Prof. Sharma deserves credit for putting in one compass the salient points concerning the fall of the Yadavas and supplying such explanation and interpretation as could be worked out with the limited sources available. Prof. Sharma touches the subject again in the last chapter also.

After depicting 'The Back-ground' Prof. Sharma details the succeeding period as that of Tutelage. During this period the Marathas had to go through a long period of discipline both in the arts of peace and war. The civil department of Government remained in their hands and their help became necessary in the military campaigns of the Muhammadans. The common traditions of Hasan Gangu being originally the slave of a Brahmin, called Gangu, perhaps our Gangaras pant as a fragmentary bakhar alluded to by Rajawade in the Proceedings of the B. I. S. Mandal says, is not referred to by Prof. Sharma. The occasional references in old traditional accounts of many a Maratha Kshatriya family to Kālā (black) Khoja and Gorā (white) Khoja may well be interpreted in terms of the conflict between the Deshi and Pardeshi parties at the Muhammadan courts of the Deccan.

During the period of tutelage, not only the pen and the sword but the soul of the Maratha people was revived through the rise of the saints. What is known as the Pandharpur movement no doubt went a great way in recreating faith and recapturing the lost soul of the people. A new and healthy turn was given to this noblest of democracies, the democracy of the Bhaktas (W. B. Patwardhan) by the dynamic personality of Ramdas who preached his philosophy of action and spread a net work of his disciples, twelve hundred in number, throughout the land. The 'Maharashtra Dharma' was not merely a religious phase. It had a deeper social and political meaning and its chief exponent was Saint Ramdas. This Maharashtra Dharma was not the direct outcome of the Pandharpur movement. These cultural and social forces, strengthened by the assertive efforts of the Dafles, the Nimbalkars, the Shirkes, the Bhosales, the Manes and numerous others, especially in the mountain fastnesses of the Maval territories, eventually led to the rise of a mighty national power—the Maratha Swarajya. All this makes one of the most fascinating and inspiring stories in the history of India, perhaps

of the world and Prof. Sharma has drawn a vivid picture of the same with necessary warmth and vigour.

The part played by Shahaji, the celebrated father of Shivaji, has been clearly brought out by the writer as the work of a great Pioneer of Maratha Swarajya. However, Prof. Sharma would have done well to have emphasised that the Danpatra of Sambhaji alludes to Shahaji as the defender of Haindava (Hindu) Dharma and that he had appointed separate officers like the Peshwa, Mujumdar for the twelve year old son, Shivaji, whom he sent away to his Poona jagir, out of which some thirty six villages were given as Mokasa to the latter. The significant seal of Shivaji found to have been used at least as early as 1645 A. D. reveals in unmistakable terms the noble aims and the firm faith and hope of the militant Maratha Swarajya party of the period. It is a matter for satisfaction for us that Prof. Sharma has boldly come forward to reaffirm the thesis of that great seer Ranade in this book and enlarge and expand it with such corrections, additions and modifications as became necessary on account of the very large amount of new sources that have accumulated during the period of nearly half a century since then.

Prof. Sharma in his later chapters treats of the rise of Sivaji and the foundation of Swarajya, the unique declaration of an independent sovereign Hindu Chhatrapati, the crisis that overtook the newly founded Swarajya after the death of Shivaji, the wonderful and stout defence that the newly created Maratha nation offered to the haughty and indomitable Alamgir, who was exhausted and at last expired in the attempt, and the final reassertion of the Maratha Power in Maharashtra. In the course of his argument Prof. Sharma had naturally to challenge the conclusions and in some places even the facts, of older veterans but he has not faltered in this work and given a good account of his mettle.

The last chapter of Prof. Sharma's review of Maratha History sums up 'the Achievement' of the Marathas. He characterises the Maratha resurgence as a unique phenomenon in Indian History. "They had created a New State and a New order superior to any that had hitherto existed in Hindu India". This view may be accepted as correct so far as we limit ourselves to

Hindu India since the rise of the Muslims in this continent. "The triumph of the Marathas" during this period "was the triumph of a people, a nation rather than that of a few men of genius" "Neither the Rajputs nor the Sikhs" nor even the Vijayanagar Empire, "could ever rise to the great eminence reached by the Marathas," "and the hidden sources" of the Maratha Power "lay in the character of the people and their country". This is indeed a warm, yet just tribute that the author pays to this masterful people

"A man of superb genius" Shivaji, the deliverer of the enslaved Marathas, must, in fact, be considered "a creature of Maharashtra". "Sivaji" the author further says "for us is neither saint nor sinner but just human, impelled by human motives, to achieve human ends in a human world" (p. 126). It is difficult to reconcile this view of the author with an earlier statement of his on pp 113 & 114 where he speaks of 'Destiny' and 'Divinity' and avers. "If Hindu civilisation was to survive, a new avatār was needed. He appeared in the person of Sivaji". We believe the former view to be more sound, which attributes more to the people and their character than to individuals, however great, or may be-avatārs.

We agree with the dictum of the author when he says, "when the authenticity of each fact is ascertained and established beyond doubt or the evidence is verified the verdict may not be shirked" (p. 125). We are, therefore, entitled to ask him whether the treaty between Sivaji and his younger brother Vyankoji quoted by the author pp. 197-199 is a genuine fact or merely an inference. The Shiv Digvijaya Bakhar may contain some very valuable truths yet we can not ascribe to the letters and documents mentioned therein the same status of validity and treat them on a par with original documents, whose reliability could be severely tested and established beyond the shadow of doubt. None of the letters quoted in the Shiv Digvijaya appear to be genuine. The so called treaty referred to by our author is obviously a product of the fertile imagination of the chronicler who is seen to be fond of the display of his knowledge! To quote such an imaginary docu-

ment, not only this, but to ascribe to it the status of 'the Political Testament' of Shivaji is going too far indeed! -

On page 181 our author similarly refers to another document which "if authentic" should in his opinion "be considered as the Magna Carta of Maratha Swarajya." On page 273 he refers to it again as 'the great charter of civil rights.' He quotes the document on page 321. The document has been published by Mr. K. S. Thackeray. But he gives no reference to its origin. On a careful examination and close comparison with genuine documents of Shivaji in original it would not take us long to convince ourselves that the document in question is not genuine. The language used is unlike the language used in the other genuine documents of Shivaji. Compare for instance such words occurring in the document as हिंदुमहाराष्ट्रात् - मुहम्मदाब्द - ज्ञातीबाले or परंतु लिहिण्याचे कारण की &c. The Govt. is here referred to as सरकार which is not found in any official letters of Shivaji. Then the ending मयादिष्ट is not enclosed in the usual form. Shivaji is referred to as श्री राजा सिवाजी छत्रपती the correct way being श्री राजा शिव छत्रपती. The seal at the top as printed in the document under examination here gives four lines instead of the five found in the genuine seals of Shivaji. Besides, the date as given in the document, corresponds to 28th Jan. 1677. Now Sarkar states that Shivaji started on his long term Carnatak campaign at the *beginning* of Jan 1677, (Sarkar's Shivaji p 289). But we are inclined to believe that Shivaji started on this campaign *earlier* when Mr Muloverer arrived from Raigry' as reported in a letter dated 2nd Oct. 1676 and supported by Vatanpatra p. 47. Shivaji had planned a long absence and hence if at all he had wished to issue a proclamation of civil rights he should have done so not at the *end* of Jan. 1677, when he was already on the march but much earlier. Enough has thus been said, we believe, to prove how the document can not be genuine. Further, the document merely confirms the different communities in the proper enjoyment of their religious practices and customs in spite of where they might have been suppressed. It is too much to describe it as Magna Carta or a proclamation of civil rights.

We are fully conscious of the fact that such issues and discussions as we have raised above can not be allowed to detain

us longer here. And yet we feel it quite necessary to invite the attention of scholars both in Maharashtra and outside to study very closely and at first hand the voluminous mass of documents, literary, political, economic, judicial and others, before they build up their conclusions and present the history of the Marathas. We will not otherwise ever succeed in doing proper justice to the subject. This is no light task we know. The scattered materials have not yet been systematically and scientifically analysed and studied in a thorough manner. That this work is beyond the scope of an individual, however gifted, needs no proving. We, however, regret to notice that scholars who are unable to read the Marathi documents in the Modi script have had the temerity to declare to a world, unfortunately ignorant of the language and script, that they have thoroughly studied the Marathi materials and have passed categorical opinions going to the length of poolpoohing the 'discoveries' and 'unearthing' of documents constantly going ahead in Maharashtra and declaring that those discoveries contain 'forgeries'. We would here warn Indian scholars against such thorough and ignorant condemnation of documents by men who are themselves unable to read even the Modi Script and are consequently not competent to pass such ex cathedra judgments. We feel confident that in the end the value and authenticity of the large mass of Marathi materials would be thoroughly proved and accepted. In the end, we welcome scholars like Prof. Sharma and their efforts to elucidate the history of the Marathas.

D. V. Potdar

ICONOGRAPHY OF ŚRĪ VIDYĀRNAVATANTRA By

Prof. S. Śrīkanṭha Śāstri, M.A., (copies can be had of
R. Harirao, Curator Mythic Society, Cenotaph Road,
Bangalore City), pp. 46. Price Rs. 1 or 2 Shillings

In spite of the few Volumes on Indian Iconography containing both textual and critical matter, the need for further studies especially of the critical variety incorporating the Iconographical data collected from numerous sources still remains. In this connection the Iconographic data contained in the numerous Tāntric works both published and unpublished is extremely valuable. The tāntric worship necessarily presupposes description of images of Gods and Goddesses and consequently our Tāntric texts which describe these Gods and Goddesses with minute details are a rich mine of information bearing on the history and development of Indian Iconography. We are therefore glad to find Prof. Śrīkantha Śāstri analysing the *Vidyārnava-tantra* published by the Govt. of Kashmir (1932-1937) and presenting its iconographic data in a clear-cut form for the benefit of the students of Indian Iconography. His method is worth being followed by other scholars with regard to numerous other Tāntric texts so that in course of time it may be possible for subsequent scholars to compile a Dictionary of Indian Iconography in which the Iconography of every image known to Indian Literature, whether Jain, Buddhist or Brahmanical, is portrayed in brief. In this manner alone the Science of Indian Iconography can be given a proper historical perspective worth the name. The contribution of Indian Iconography to Indian art in general can only be exactly ascertained on the strength of scientifically collected material recorded in the form of a Dictionary. In his present brochure Prof. Śāstri has given us the Iconographic material under the groups of images named severally as the *Śākta*, *Śāiva*, *Vaiṣṇava*, *Saura*, *Kaumāra*, *Gāṇapatya* etc. The essential characteristics of these groups have also been pointed out by him. This grouping will be found useful not only by the students of Indian Iconography but also by the students of Hindu religion who care to know its iconographic aspect.

According to Prof. Śāstri, the present work was composed between A. D. 1520 and 1720, a period when the tantras appear

to have been radiating their iconographic lustre as will be seen from the present analysis of the *Vidyārṇava Tantra*. If we analyse some of the celebrated Tantras composed during a definite period of history, we shall get a very clear idea of the development of Indian Iconography of that period. We trust therefore that Prof. Śāstri himself will analyse at least a few major tantras pertaining to the different periods of history so as to make his study representative of the entire field of Indian Iconography.

The regional aspect of Indian Iconography which still remains shrouded in mystery also deserves our special attention in view of the present interest of the Indian public in the history of different regions of India in all its aspects.

We, therefore, congratulate Prof. Śāstri on his present critical study which is as pains-taking and scholarly as his previous studies in other fields of Indology.

P. K. Gode

SAṄGĪTA RATNĀKARA Translation by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja,
(Adyar Library Series).

In the past, the Ānandāsram-edition of the Sangīta Ratnākara was the only well-known edition which contained the full text and also the commentary of Kallinath. The present edition contains the commentary of Simhabhūpāla in addition to the text and the commentary of Kallinath. Further, the Adyar series has done a good service to the public in simultaneously issuing an English translation of both the text and the two commentaries, along with critical notes explaining the subtle terms and ideas involved, from the pen of no less a person than Dr. C. Kunhan Raja.

Only a working knowledge of Sanskrit is not enough to understand the exact meaning of the text and to interpret it in the terms of modern musical practices. One and the same Sanskrit term is used often in different contexts, 'Mandra and Tara' as explained by Dr. Raja, is an instance in view. It was a pit-fall to many in the past, and it could now be avoided, with the help of an authoritative version of the text like the present one.

In translating the text, the needs of those who want to follow the sanskrit text in its original form and syntax are given a preference to those of a casually interested reader. Such a procedure needs verbal fidelity and a close adherence to the Sanskrit syntax and the retention of the original technical terms, instead of using their corresponding English synonyms. Over and above the translation, Dr. Raja has elucidated many intricate points that crop up from time to time, by appending his own comments.

There are a few misprints which can be easily corrected by a habitual reader ; one or two however need special correction. Thus in the last line of verse 48 on page 60 of the translation, the word *interval* should have been avoided as it is a technical term in the music of today and conveys the idea of a ' ratio ' and not of the śruti-distance. Under verse 50 page 60, ' Ni and Dha have two śrutis ' ; here it is Ga and not Dha which has two śrutis. Similarly lines 11 and 12 on page 60 should read ' thus it is that Ri and Dha on one side, *with* Ga and Ni *respectively* on the other, are discordant. The present sentence leaves ground for misapprehension.

Similarly, Sanskrit terms should be printed in one and the same way, either with capitals or with small letters and the sequence of the original terms and their English synonyms should not be changed on and off, at least in one and the same sentence.

Scholars of Indian music distinctly stand to gain from such a translation as it will enable them to interpret *correctly* the meaning and significance of many terms and passages, which in the past have suffered misrepresentation and distortion at the hands of many interpreters,—interpreters who knew music but not enough Sanskrit and vice versa.

In the end, I would suggest that when the whole of the translation is issued it should be supplemented by a key to the identification of the Rāgas as given in the Ratnākara, with the Rāgas of to-day. If a clue to such a key remains undiscovered I am afraid, the music of the Ratnākara will remain a sealed book as ever.

G. H. R.

BHARATĪYA MĀNASASĀSTRA-Ī ARIBHĀSĀ · Indian

Psychological Terminology, by Professor D. D. Vadekar ;
pages 402 ; Bombay Book Depot, Bombay , price Rs. 10.

It is very encouraging indeed to find that educationists in this country are now realising that the best medium of imparting education—even higher education—is the student's own language. Vigorous efforts are therefore being made, at several centres of learning, to introduce Indian languages as media of instruction. Apart from the unquestioned educational value of such a course, it has a high moral value as well—particularly in a country, like India, which has laboured long under foreign domination. A century of education through the medium of English has created among generations of Indian students an inferiority complex with regard to their own languages and consequently with regard to their past culture and future potentialities. Every effort therefore in the direction of facilitating the imparting of education—particularly higher scientific and technical education—through the medium of Indian languages is to be welcomed whole-heartedly. *Indian Psychological Terminology* by Prof. D. D. Vadekar is one such brilliant effort. On account of the multiplicity of principal languages current in this vast country, the problem of a common medium in all centres of learning has become very much complicated. Prof. Vadekar is quite conscious of this. He has therefore tried to evolve, on scientific lines, "Plan and Principles," which would make his terminology suitable for "a basic, common and interprovincial use in the exposition of psychological subjects in all modern Indian languages of established Sanskritic affinities and associations". Prof. Vadekar's work is not an ordinary dictionary. He gives the exact scientific connotation of a technical term and not merely its literal rendering in Indian language. For one single term he has suggested several equivalents, thus allowing a wide scope for selection. Two main requisites of a New Terminology are that it has to be significant—*anvartaka*—and that it has to be simple and easy of currency. Prof. Vadekar's work is quite creditable from this point of view. He has tried to give equivalents which are not

unnecessarily pedantic. In most cases they are quite felicitous. But the real test of such terminology lies in its actual use in scientific works written in Indian languages. It is to be earnestly hoped that scholars will utilise Prof. Vadekar's valuable terminology in large measure, will enrich the scientific literature of India and will thus make it accessible to a larger public.

Prof. Vadekar has planned a whole *Indian Philosophical Terminology*, the present *Psychological* work being its first part. He is rendering great service to Philosophy and Indian Languages alike through his work, and deserves the best thanks of all students and teachers of both the subjects.

—R. N. D.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Anwar Nāma of Abjadī, by Muhammad Husayn Mahvi, University of Madras, 1944
- Atharva-Veda-Samhitā, Translated into Tamil, by M. R. Jambunathan, Madras.
- Balabhāratam of Agastya Pandita, with the commentary Manoharā, of Sālva Timmaya Dandanātha, [Part I, cantos I-III, by P. P. S. Sastri, Shri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam, 1939
- Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum, Iravas and Culture, change by A. Aiyappan, Madras, 1945.
- The Calendar Supplement for 1945, University of Calcutta, 1945.
- Debates Commentary, by B. C. Law, Pali Text Society, London, 1940
- Dhūrtākhyāna of Haribhadra Sūri, by Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1944.
- Digvijaya Mahākāya, by Pandit Ambalala Premachandra Shah, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1945
- Our Educational Effort, Fergusson College through Sixty years, by Prof. S. R. Sharma, Decan Education Society Poona, 1945.
- Education in India Today by Prof. P. M. Lunaye, Arya-bhushana Press, Poona, 1945
- Jagadvijayacchandasa of Kavindrācārya, by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner, 1945.
- Jayapura Raja Vamsyavali, A History of the Solar Dynasty of Jeypore-Orissa, by Pandit Ramanatha Nanda Sarma, Jeypore Samathanam, Madras, 1943.
- The Theory of Karma, by M. G. Merchant, Bhavanagar.
- Kenopanisad-Bhāṣya, by Sri Rangaramanuja, edited by K. C. Varadachari and D. T. Tatacharya Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series, Tirupati, 1945.
- B. C. Law Volume, Part I, Edited by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar etc. The Indian Research Institute, Calcutta, 1945
- Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit, by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras, 1945
- The following six works—
- (1) मधुविद्या यागदर्पण
 - (2) श्रीजयन्तीवारणकालप्रकाशिका
 - (3) श्रीजयन्तीवारणासमाप्ति
 - (4) समस्यमानसुकस्यैर्वनिष्कर्षः
 - (5) इस्तीशैवमयम्
 - (6) लब्धाह्निकम् bound together,
- by Sri Ranga Ramanujaswami Kumbhakonam.

- Maharshi and his Message, by
Paul Brunton, Madras.
- Maha Yoga by Who, Sri Ramana-
srama, Tiruvannamala
- A Message of Peace to a World
full of Unrest, delivered by
Sri Swami Tulsiramji Maharaj
Bikaner.
- Mudrārāksasapūrvasamkathā-
naka of Anantasarma, by
Dasharatha Sharma, Anup San-
skrit Library, Bikaner, 1945
- Nandapur (A Forsaken Kingdom)
Part I, by Kumar Bidyadhan
Singh Deo, Jeypore, 1938.
- Nayamañjarī, by Śrīmad Appaya-
dikṣita, edited by P. P. S. Sastri
Sri Vani Vilas Press,
Srirangam, 1941.
- Parmar Inscription, in Dhar
State, 875-1310 A. D., Anand
Sagar Press Darbar, Dhar.
- पादश्लेषनं, by Sri Rangaramanuja-
swami, Tirupati, 1944.
- La Pensée De Ghazzālī, by
Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris VI.
- Persian Catalogue, by C. V.
Joshi, State Records Depart-
ment, Baroda, 1945.
- Pirit Nula Le Fil De Pirit,
by Marguerite la Fuente,
Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris VI.
1941.
- Prabuddha Bharata or Awakened
India, Golden Jubilee Number,
1945, Swami Yogeshwara-
nanda, Calcutta, 1945.
- Rāgavibodha of Somanātha, by
Pandit S. Subrahmanya Sastri,
Adyar Library, Adyar, 1945.
- Rajasthanī Vira-Gīta, Part I,
Sadul Oriental Series,
Volume I, Anup Sanskrit
Library, Bikaner, 1945.
- Rāsallā Nāma Preksanaka, by
Dr. V. Raghavan, 1945.
- Ristāsamuccaya of Durgadeva,
by Dr. A. S. Gopani, Bharatiya
Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1945.
- Sama Vedam, by M. R.
Jambunathan, Madras
- Samayika Patha, by R. N.
Shaha, Sri Vira Grantha-
mālā, Sangali, 1945.
- Samdeśa Rāsaka of Abdul
Rahaman, by Śrī Jina Vijaya
Muni, Bharatiya Vidya
Bhavan, Bombay, 1945.
- Śatakṛatrayam, by Prof. D. D.
Kosambi, Ānandaśrama,
Poona, 1945.
- Sāyan Fables of Houses, for
Latitudes 8° to 35° North, by
R. V. Vaidya, Astronomical
and Astrological Association,
Gwalior, 1945
- Sivagnana Botham of Meykanda
Deva, translated with Notes
and Introduction, by J. M.
Nallaswami Pillai, Dharma-
puram, 1945.
- The Slave of Ideas and other
plays, by A. S. Panchapakasa
Ayyar, C. Coomaraswamy
Naidu & Sons, Madras, 1941.

- Śṛṅgāraprakāśa Part I Prakāśas 1, 2 by Mahārājādhirāja Sri Bhoja Deva, Edited by P. P. S. Sastri, Shri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam, 1942
- Suvarṇasaptati Sastra, Sāṅkhyā Kārikā Saptati of Īśvara Kṛṣṇa with a commentary reconstructed into Sanskrit from the Chinese Translation of Paramārtha, and edited by N. Aiyaswami Sastri, Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series, Tirupati, 1944
- Three famous tales, by A. S. P. Ayyar, G. V. K. Swamy & Co. Kumbakonam
- Ta'rikh Nama-I-Harat, (the History of Harat), by Muhammad Z. Aḥ-siddiqui, Calcutta, 1944.
- The Royal Jester, or Tenali Rama, by A. S. P. Ayyar, K. V. Press, Book Depot, Vellore, 1943.
- A Short History of the Terapanthi Sect of the Svetambar Jains and its Tenets, Srichand Rampuria, Calcutta, 1944.
- Tirukkural Kamattupal, by T. P. Palaniappa Pillali, Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series, Tirupati, 1945.
- Short Stories from the great Upanisads, by M. R. Jambunathan, Madras.
- The following six works—
- (1) उक्तिनिष्ठापरिब्राजम्
 - (2) गुणदोषदर्पणः
 - (3) न्यासोल्लासभावचन्द्रिका
 - (4) न्यासपरिष्ठाद्धिबिमर्शनम्
 - (5) तत्त्वबोधिनी
 - (6) दृष्टे निराकारणम् bound together, by Sri Ranga Ramanujaswami, Kumbhakonam.
- All about the Vedas in Tamil, by M. R. Jambunathan, Madras.
- विक्रमांक (उत्तरार्ध), संवत् २००१ वैक्रम, नागरीप्रचारिणी सभा, काशी.
- Ancient Wisdom of Wales, by D. Jeffrey Williams, Adyar Library, Adyar, 1945.
- यजुर्वेदशतपथब्राह्मणकथा, by M. R. Jambunathan, Madras.
- Yajurvedam, by M. R. Jambunathan, Madras.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE

Mahabharata Volumes already published

Rs. As.

Vol. I-Ādiparvan (1), ed., Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M.A., Ph.D. ; Fasc. 1-7 , pp. cxviii + 996.	33 0
Vol. II-Sabhaparvan (2), ed., Prof. Dr. F. Edgerton , Fasc. 13-14 ; pp. LXVII + 517	12 0
Vols. III & IV-Āranyakaparvan (3) ed., Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, M.A., Ph.D. ; Fasc. 11-12 ; pp. XLII + 1111.	18 0
Vol. V-Virāṭaparvan (4), ed., Dr. Raghu Vira, M.A., Ph.D. ; Fasc. 8 , pp. LX + 362.	11 0
Vol. VI-Udyogaparvan (5), ed., Dr. S. K. De, M.A., D.Litt. , Fasc. 9-10 , pp. LIV + 739	19 0
Vol. _____	8 0

बोर सेवा मन्दिर

पुस्तकालय

Vol.

काल न०

Ta

लेखक

शीर्षक

Ni

खण्ड XXVI

क्रम संख्या

i,

225

1 0

7 8

4 0

4 0

5 0

5 0

Dikshat, K. N.
Annals of the Bharatavar
oriental.
3631